

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1881.

ART. I.—THE RELIGIOUS PRESS.

The Newspaper Press Directory. Thirty-sixth Annual Issue. London: C. Mitchell & Co. 1881.

A WRITER in the "Saturday Review," a few weeks ago, delivered himself concerning newspapers in general, in terms which drew down upon his devoted head the fiercest wrath of the whole journalistic world. "Excessive newspaper reading," he said, "is a sure destroyer of mental health. Its effect is to corrupt the judgment, to weaken the sense of mental discrimination, to discourage intellectual initiative, and generally to deaden the mental powers by substituting a habit of mechanical for a habit of intelligent reading. A very little yielding to this disposition," he goes on, "will produce, even in cultivated men, a habit which may almost be said to be worse from an intellectual point of view than the habit of not reading at all." Some such reflection as this must necessarily strike every thoughtful man, as he turns over the pages of the volume the title of which we have placed at the head of this article. Two hundred and thirty-six closely printed pages of imperial 8vo, wholly devoted to particulars concerning the newspapers of the United Kingdom, afford a sufficiently striking evidence of the enormous interests involved in the newspaper press, and testify to the readiness of the people of this country to absorb a practically unlimited quantity of literature of this description. That this is an altogether healthy state of things, and a sign of the growing intelligence of the nation, is certainly open to question. The weary speakers who return thanks for the toast of "The Press," at the fag end of municipal and other banquets, of course rejoice over it, and triumphantly point to the enterprise, and industry, and cultivated public feeling of which it is the sign. Yet there

are some amongst us who are sufficiently heretical to think that the "Saturday" Reviewer did not go quite far enough in his condemnation of excessive newspaper reading, and who trace to it no small part of that decay of patriotism, of public spirit, and of private morality, as well as of that increasing frivolity and want of serious aim in life which are so unhappily characteristic of the present day. A people who, like the Athenians of old, spend their lives "either in telling or hearing some new thing"—in other words, in gossiping—are not likely to be animated by very high aims, or guided by any very intelligent standard. And to the great mass of newspaper readers their favourite literature is only another form of gossip. Perhaps one in ten may read the leading articles, and study the telegrams with intelligence, but the rest look only at those portions of the paper which contain what may be most accurately described as gossip—and sometimes as gossip of the worst kind; police reports, reports of proceedings in the law courts—and especially those of the Court in which Sir James Hannen daily puts asunder those whom God is supposed to have joined—accidents and offences, and all the little trivial scraps of news which are forgotten as soon as read, and which have not the slightest interest for, and do not in the smallest degree concern any save the actors in the events recorded.

But the matter has an even graver side than this. On all sides it is lamented, and especially in Protestant communities, that faith appears to be decaying. Nor can there be much doubt that outside the pale of the Catholic Church religion is becoming year by year a less potent influence. The outward forms remain but the soul has departed. In the Church of England fashion appears to be the prevailing power. A hundred years ago the fashion was what is now called "high and dry" Churchmanship. The clergy were simply country gentlemen, who on Sundays put on a surplice, and read prayers and a sermon; whilst on week-days they farmed, hunted, shot, fished, and took their part in county business like any other laymen. Then followed the wave of Evangelical reaction, when the great mass of the clergy did their best to inspire their people with aspirations after holiness by the light of a curiously narrow and mistaken creed. It was natural that a recoil should follow, and that the excessive individualism, which is the leading characteristic of the so-called Evangelical party, should lead the more thoughtful amongst them to endeavour to realize the essentially corporate character of the Christianity they professed. The result was the publication of "Tracts for the Times," with the inevitable sequel—the submission to the Church of some of the greatest intellects in the Anglican body. As Lord Beaconsfield has said, that secession inflicted a blow upon the Church of England

beneath which she yet reels. It certainly had the effect of intensifying the differences which notoriously exist amongst the members of that very miscellaneous body. The after effects of the "Tracts" have been peculiar. Those who accept their teaching carefully refrain, save in very rare instances, from carrying it to its logical consequences, while those who reject it drift year by year farther from what it is the fashion to call "the old Evangelical standards," and now form what they are pleased to describe as the "Broad Church party"—a sect, the principal article of whose creed seems to be the absurdity of having a creed at all, and whose Christianity is of so remarkable a type as wholly to abandon the supernatural element in it. All these varying parties have their organs in the press, as have also the multitude of the sects into which Protestantism outside the Church of England is divided; and their wranglings and bitterness do not, certainly, afford the impartial looker-on a very exalted idea of the effect of such religious teaching as is supplied from the pulpits of the Establishment and of the various dissenting bodies. No one, in fact, can make a study of these so-called "religious" newspapers, without arriving at a tolerably definite opinion that the tendency towards unbelief, which is so eminently characteristic of the present day, is due in no small degree to the operations of these prints. In the following pages we propose to examine their leading characteristics with as much impartiality as is possible under the circumstances.

Excluding four organs devoted to the interests of the Catholic Church, the religious papers published in London are, it appears from Messrs. Mitchell & Co.'s valuable guide, thirty-six in number. Eleven of these represent the varying parties into which the Protestant establishment is divided; two are organs of the Baptists; one proudly describes itself as the organ of Nonconformity, and takes for its motto the words "The Dissidence of Dissent and the Protestantism of the Protestant Religion;" Wesleyanism has three organs; Quakerism and Judaism each two; and Presbyterianism, Primitive Methodism, and Unitarianism each one. Besides these, eight papers describe themselves as 'Unsectarian,'—by which word we may understand excessively sectarian—and two as "Protestant," one of which "endeavours to unite all on the common ground of Protestantism, and seeks to bring forward the common danger of Romanism," while the other is a "non-Sectarian Evangelical Protestant" journal, which reports sermons, lectures, and general religious intelligence.

Of the "Ecclesiastical Gazette" nothing need be said in this place. It is the official organ of the Church of England, and is not a newspaper save in the most limited sense of the term. It is published on the Friday after the second Tuesday in every

month, and though nominally issued at the price of sixpence, its circulation is almost purely gratuitous, copies being sent free of charge to every bishop and other dignitary of the Church of England and to every beneficed clergyman of the same body. The contents are not of overwhelming interest to the general reader, consisting as they do, mainly of official documents relating to the Establishment, with occasionally an original paper of almost ostentatious colourlessness on some matter of general interest. The "Guardian" is a far more important and far more widely read organ. Established at the beginning of 1846 as the organ of that section of the Church of England which describes itself as "Anglo-Catholic," it speedily assumed a position as organ of the country clergy, much in the same way as the "Field" is accurately described as "the Country Gentleman's Newspaper." There is hardly a country-house in the kingdom where the latter organ of "Sports, Pastimes, and Natural History" is not delivered with Sunday morning's letters, and where it does not beguile the tedium of Sunday afternoon. In the same way there is hardly a country parsonage which is not enlivened on Thursday by the handsome broadsheet of the "Guardian." The first number of this journal appeared on the 21st of January 1846, in the height of the Corn-Law struggle, and at the time when the relations of Great Britain with Ireland, and with the United States on the Oregon Question, were in a painfully strained condition. It is not very easy to understand from the opening leading article what line the conductors intended to take in politics; the only point about which there was no uncertainty being that the paper was neither Whig nor Radical. Eventually it developed into a Peelite organ, but the phrases of the first number hardly point in that direction. When a Minister is described as "mysterious and intangible—alienating supporters but commanding votes—not liked, not venerated, but felt to be indispensable—ready to retire, but nobody would dare to take his place, and all would be sixes and sevens until he got back again"—when, we say, a newspaper speaks of a Minister in such terms, it can hardly be said that it uses the language of a warm supporter. By the time the "Guardian" had reached its fourteenth number, a sort of settlement had been arrived at. A new series was commenced, the size of the sheet was greatly enlarged, and the "Guardian" is found to be pronouncing the shibboleth of Free Trade with quite the orthodox accent. Its ecclesiastical tendencies speedily became very strongly marked, and more space was given to articles and correspondence on these subjects, the tone being uniformly that of the more orthodox Church of England type. Thus, in the second number of the new series, may be found an elaborate attack upon the Evangelical Alliance, written

we are bound to confess, with both force and wit, for their attempt to construct a new "creed of Christendom." On the lines thus laid down the "Guardian" has continued to flourish for five-and-thirty years. So long as Sir Robert Peel lived it supported him; so long as the Peelites continued to exist as a party it was distinctly Peelite; when that party was reduced to one member, in the person of Mr. Gladstone, it transferred its entire allegiance to him. The clients of the "Guardian" do not invariably relish the devotion of their organ to the extremely versatile statesman who for the present sways the destinies of England; and it is not a little amusing to observe the complaining tone in which some of them protest when they find an apology for an unusually flagrant piece of tergiversation or high handedness on his part forced as it were down their throats. Still, however, they accept it—"reluctantly and mutinously," as Lord Macaulay said of the Tories who supported Peel; for the "Guardian" is necessary to the English clergy. It is not only a most useful organ for communication between various members of that body, but it is written in a style which gentlemen and men of education can readily tolerate. The political leaders are readable, intelligent and moderate in tone, and the leaders on ecclesiastical subjects are, from the point of view of the moderate "High Anglican," irreproachable. Of course mistakes are made from time to time. Thus, when Bishop Reinkens and the new sect of "Old Catholics" were guilty of making a new schism in the Church, both he and they found a warm apologist in the "Guardian," whilst the proceedings of the Vatican Council were attacked in a fashion which proved very satisfactorily the justice of the claim of the Church of England to the title of Protestant. For the rest the "Guardian"—allowing for all differences of opinion—is by no means an unfavourable specimen of newspapers of this particular class. The tone of culture and urbanity by which it is characterized is precisely that which might be expected in the homes of the English clergy, and if at times there is a certain air of patronage in its references to the adherents to the ancient faith of Christendom it is redeemed by the indubitable scholarship of most of its contributors, and by the efforts which they are visibly making towards a higher life and a more complete creed than that which they now possess. That it is politically given over to Gladstonism need surprise no one who is aware of the peculiar fascination which that statesman exercises over those with whom he is brought into contact, and especially those who were trained in the schools of Oxford, and who have sat at the feet of Peel.

The "Record" is a paper of a very different character. It may fairly be described as the organ of "The Clapham Sect"—as it

was the fashion to call the "Evangelical Party" (so called) in the Church of England in the earlier years of the present century. The paper is understood to have taken its origin in certain conversations held over the dinner-table of a well-known city magnate (Mr. A. Hamilton) in the year 1825, at which the friends of William Wilberforce were wont to assist. The first number was not, however, published until the 1st of January, 1828, after being heralded by a prospectus of a length which might have been expected from a sect which lays the extremest stress on what it is pleased to style "the ordinance of preaching." This wonderful document commences with a general dissertation on "the varied and extensive influence of the newspaper," and goes on to ask whether "the parent or the master of a family can indulge a reasonable hope that the constantly repeated history of vice and crime, told with all its disgusting details, and without any serious expression of horror at its enormities, will leave no pernicious impression on the minds of those whom Providence has committed to his care?" Having answered this question entirely to their own satisfaction, the promoters of the "Record" go on to say that they consider it a duty to establish a journal which shall give the news of the day "unaffected by the disgusting and dangerous character of those baneful ingredients which circulate in intimate, though certainly not inseparable, union" with it. An editor had, we learn, been appointed for this purpose, who—happy man!—was to work under the control of a committee of management. On the lines thus laid down, the "Record" has been issued twice a week, from Tuesday, the 1st of January, 1828, up to the present time, and its theological views remain exactly what they were at the beginning. The first piece of original writing which was published by this journal, was a violent attack on the Catholic Bishops and Clergy of Ireland, and an apology for those conversions "by the bribe of a bonnet or a pair of shoes," which the writer actually treats as so much a matter of course as not even to require contradiction. The same kind of thing is to be found in the "Record" of to-day; but of late years this journal has awakened to the fact that the narrow teaching of the "Clapham Sect" is menaced quite as much from the side of intellectual activity, as from that of ecclesiastical supremacy. The Catholic Church, it is beginning to see, is not the only opponent of Calvinism, though, as becomes a paper of zealously Protestant principles, it naturally traces everything to which it takes objection to the influence of "Popery." The result is somewhat curious, since the "Record" would seem to trace the vagaries of the party who indulge in what the late Prime Minister called a "Masquerade Mass," to the direct influence of the Vatican, and at the same time to refer to the same malign power the peculiar scepticism

of Professors Tyndall and Huxley. The Conservatism of the "Record" is, indeed, unimpeachable, but its zeal is not always according to knowledge. Only a few years ago a very remarkable illustration of the kind of thing which finds favour in "Evangelical" and Protestant circles was afforded by this paper. When the *Great Eastern*—most unlucky of steam-ships—was launched, it may be remembered that there was a very terrible accident. Some of the machinery broke down, and several of the workmen were horribly injured in consequence, some six or seven being carried away in a dying condition. Coincidentally with this accident came the news, first, that the directors of the company by whom the ship had been built, had—from what motive has never been explained—decided to change the name of the ship from *Great Eastern* to *Leviathan*; and, secondly, that the ship itself, in process of launching, had stuck upon the "ways," and could not be got off. Straightway the "Record" published what was perhaps the most remarkable leading article of the year. The readers of this instructive paper were informed with the utmost gravity that the accident in question was a direct manifestation of the Divine wrath on account of the change in the name of the ship. "With all deep theologians," said the "Record," "Leviathan is a Scriptural synonym for devil." On this notion the "Record" built perhaps the most amazing argument ever seen in a newspaper, even of the type now under consideration. There was some clumsy jocularity, which to men of the world outside the charmed circles of Evangelicalism certainly appeared somewhat profane, about the Almighty having "put a hook in the nose" of Leviathan, but the argument of the writer was—nakedly stated—that the Creator was so angry with his creatures for having given to a big ship a name which in the opinion of "deep theologians" is a synonym for that of the author of Evil, that he caused a dreadful accident to happen, by which a number of working-men, who had nothing whatever to do with the change of the ship's name, lost their lives, while their equally innocent families were plunged into undeserved distress and suffering. This view of the Divine nature and purposes appears to be that most in favour with the readers of the "Record;" for, though not so openly stated, it is in the main identical with that which usually underlies the interpretations of current events which are to be found in its leading articles.

If, however, the "Record" is a somewhat violent, and to disinterested observers a somewhat profane organ of "Evangelical Protestantism," it is surpassed in these respects by its contemporary the "Rock." This journal—which, by the way, was said at one time to be edited by an Irish Orangeman and Presbyterian, but which is now in the hands of an Anglican clergyman—was

started at the beginning of 1868, in support of the Protestant character of the then "United Church of England and Ireland." Its opening address, which is of the usual type of extreme Protestantism, declares that its province is "to appeal to the masses of this great Empire in defence of Christianity as it came fresh and pure from the lips of its Divine founder, and from the oracles of God; and as it was restored at the Reformation by those Protestant confessors who sealed their protest against Rome, and their faith in the Redeemer, by the blood of martyrdom." But the "Rock" aspires to an even higher part than that of merely defending the faith: it carries the war into the enemy's camp; only, as the enemy is not at all likely to read its diatribes, it is hard to see what other effect they can have than that of intensifying party feeling, and making its Protestant readers more bitter than they were before. "It will be ours, too," this opening address goes on, "to wage a warfare of reason and fact and argument against the corrupt teachings and traditions of the Roman Church; against the principles and practices of Ritualism, and against the dangers and the delusions of that Rationalism which seeks to set the intellect of man above his soul, and does violence to human reason by its misapplication." The way in which the work is to be accomplished appears in the first number. Under the heading of "Topics of the Week" there are series of paragraphs directed against the Irish Bishops and the English High Churchmen. Roman "difficulties" are dealt with in a remarkably comprehensive and simple manner. The writer has got hold of a copy of the creed of Pope Pius IV., over the thirteenth article of which he makes merry in the following fashion:—

As the Roman Church does not pretend to be the mother of the Jewish Church the declaration must mean that she is the mother and mistress of all Christian Churches. To be the mother and mistress of all Christian Churches is to admit the existence of other Christian Churches. Therefore, a member of the Roman Church must admit as a fact that there are other Christian Churches besides the Roman Church. But he is bound to believe, as a point of *faith*, that the Roman Church is the mother and mistress of all Christian Churches.

Such stuff as this appears to suit the readers of the "Rock," for articles of the same kind are constantly published in its columns. On matters of fact the "Rock" is equally untrustworthy. Thus in the same article we find the statement that "A Christian Church was planted in England either by Paul himself, or by one of the Apostles, before Paul went to Rome; and, as a fact, England was in no way indebted to Rome for her Christianity." The reader of the "Rock" is often puzzled to know which to admire most—the ignorance or the

audacity of this accuser of his brethren. The "poetry" of the first number affords an opportunity of judging to what extent the boast of the opening address is justified—that the "Rock" is devoted to "the advancement and maintenance of the truth as enshrined in the Word of God." The name of the paper, it will be remembered, is an allusion to that conferred by our Lord upon S. Peter; and accordingly the first number appropriately enough contains what is called a "Reformation Ballad," with the title of "The Foundation Rock." After quoting the words of our Lord the balladist goes on—

Peter thou art, but not on such a Rock
Can I upbuild that fabric vast and tall,
Which, rising heavenward, shall the lightnings mock,
And stand secure when storms and tempests fall.

No flesh-foundation could its weight upbear,
No creature strength could those rude shocks sustain,
Still less the frail one, who will soon declare
He knows me not when one dark cloud shall rain.

* * * *

The later issues of the "Rock" fully bear out the promise of the earlier. Thus, in that for the 4th of March last, we find that this veracious print coolly identifies the obstructives in the House of Commons with "the Romish members;" and this in the face of the fact that Mr. Parnell is a Protestant of a rather marked type. It is only fair to say, however, that the "Rock" is quite as bitter against the Ritualistic party in the Anglican Church, whom its contributors accuse in no measured terms of "doing the work of Rome," and of desiring to propagate "the immoral teaching inculcated by the Jesuits, and criminal aims of that society." Some idea of the Christian charity and gentle tolerance of this faithful exponent of modern Protestantism may be formed from a letter in the number for the 4th of March above-mentioned. Speaking of the rival Anglican Societies—the Church Association, which has prosecuted the Ritualistic clergy, and the English Church Union, which has found the funds for their defence—the writer says that he has "no patience with those who affect to treat the English Church Union and the Church Association as a pair of equal delinquents. As well might they speak of the London thieves and the London police as equally disagreeable sets of people."

What the "Rock" does for the Low Church party, the "Church Times" does for its opponents of the Ritualistic clique of Anglicans. The great object of this journal is to prove that the Establishment is a true branch of the Catholic Church; and

this object it aims at attaining by attacks upon the Anglican bishops of a most amusingly ferocious kind, by habitual and systematic abuse of the "Reformers," from Luther and Melancthon down to Cranmer and Ridley, by dissertations upon points of ritual and the shape of vestments, and finally by savage attacks upon the Catholic Church in matters of both doctrine and practice. The tone of the paper is habitually one of anger and ill-temper, as if the writers were conscious of being in an utterly false position, and did not quite know how to get out of it; while, as regards scholarship and urbanity, the utter absence of those qualities is apt to lead the reader to believe that the contents of this paper must be the production of what Sidney Smith—whom the Whigs would have made a bishop but for his inveterate habit of joking—was wont to call "wild curates." It would be easy to compile a "Florilegium" of no ordinary beauty from the issues of this journal during the last few years; but a few quotations from the numbers published during the present year may serve to show what manner of print it is which finds favour with the extremer members of the Ritualistic school of Anglicans. First, as regards the bishops. It might be thought that these officials of the Establishment would receive an almost unlimited amount of reverence and obedience from men who derive their orders from them, and who constantly profess to depend upon the validity of the Anglican succession as a proof of their own "Catholic" position. The very reverse, is, however, the case. The "Church Times" has hardly words strong enough to express its loathing and contempt for those whom it professes to believe the guardians of the faith, and the bulwarks of the Church. Times without number it has repeated that "whenever any real difficulty has occurred in which the Church has been in danger of losing her spiritual privileges, the main body of the bishops have been on the adverse side;"* that "the chief obstacles to church reform have been the bishops;"† and that the bishops lead and encourage the people to do wrong. Sometimes the journal is facetious at the expense of the bishops. Thus, a correspondent writes to say that being at S. Paul's on a certain Sunday, he counted fifteen sleepers in a congregation of fifty persons; on which we have the bracketed remark: "Our correspondent forgets Bishop Claughton was preaching.—Ed."‡ Sometimes the bishops are instructed in their duties, or rather the clergy are taught how to behave to their ecclesiastical superiors. It would appear that some of the bishops have made a rule not to confirm catechumens until they have attained the age of puberty. This the "Church Times" considers to be wrong, and

* Jan. 14, 1881.

† Feb. 18.

‡ Feb. 25.

accordingly advises its clerical readers that "if the child is ready and desirous to be confirmed, but is deprived of that blessing by the arbitrary and illegal conduct of the bishop, it is clearly the duty of the parish priest to admit such child to Holy Communion." The value of the opinions of the paper on the state of the Catholic Church may be estimated from the fact that one of its most important contributors is that Dr. Littledale who had the courage to say that the Vatican Decrees were "a lie," and that those who promulgated them knew them to be such. One gem may, however, fairly find a place here. It is from a letter signed "Archer Gurney," and dated from "The Vicarage, Rhayader, Feb. 10th, 1881." The substance of the letter itself is an attempt to demonstrate that "we are living in the Time of the End"—a theory which the writer endeavours to support by a number of speculations quite worthy of Dr. Cumming "of Scotland," as Pope Pius IX. described him. This wonderful production ends thus:—

Now of all unfulfilled events it behoves us to speak with modesty; but what should this be if not Catholic Reunion on the basis of the worship of the Lamb? The corrupt system which has so long possessed itself of the mighty Latin Church is doomed to speedy overthrow, and that forbidden giving of the heart's affections to the creature, which Scripture calls spiritual fornication, will be found no more. No longer will our Lord's abiding work as the High Priest and Lamb that was slain, in Heaven, and Heaven's kingdom be merged in antedated judgship; no longer will Mary and Joseph be regarded as mediators between Him and us! The Jerusalem of the wonderful 16th chapter of Ezekiel will remember her ways and be ashamed when she shall receive her sisters, the elder and the younger (the Greek and the Anglican), so that she may never more open her mouth because of her shame when he is pacified towards her, saith the Lord God.*

There is only one word by which an educated man of average common-sense is likely to describe writing of this kind, and that is, *rigmarole*; to which a man of devout habit of mind might be tempted to prefix the epithet *profane*. The extraordinary part of the matter is, however, that people who write and read stuff of this kind should imagine that they are in any sense of the word Catholic, and that they should—as they certainly do—expect that the Church should make advances to them in the hope of securing their valuable support.

Akin to the "Church Times" is the "Church Review," a little print whose first number was issued on New Year's Day,

* "Church Times," Feb. 25, 1881.

1861, at the price of sixpence, but which now appears at the more modest figure of a penny. The object of the paper, as originally announced, was not to supply news, but "to provide those who have neither the time nor the means for a search into original sources with a repertory of arguments, ready for use, in defence of the Catholic Faith as the English Church has received it from the beginning." Party spirit was earnestly and even eagerly disavowed, and a sort of undertaking was given that information and opinion would be obtained from all sources, whether "Roman, Greek, or Lutheran." Above all things, the reader was assured that "this is no commercial speculation. . . . The gain which is set forth as the one aim and end of the undertaking is the vindication of 'the Faith as it was once delivered to the saints.'" At the outset the paper was in many respects an imitation of the "Saturday Review," while it had a sort of quasi-official character as the organ of the English Church Union. Whilst the original form was maintained the character of the paper stood deservedly very high amongst those which represent the Anglican body. Its articles were scholarly and well written, and the reviews of new books were done with very considerable ability. Since it has been converted into a penny weekly paper it has, however, fallen off somewhat seriously. Its politics remain what they were—Conservative, but not violently so—and in religious matters its tone is distinctly less truculent than the excitable "Church Times." There is also a most commendable absence from its pages of those rancorous diatribes with which the readers of the latter organ are but too familiar. Even here, however, illustrations may occasionally be found of the hatred and distrust with which the Ritualistic party regard their Bishops. For instance, it would seem that the Bishop of Rochester has thought fit to make some alterations in the arrangements for the services in a church in his diocese. Even on the most pronounced of Anglican theories, it might be thought that in so doing Dr. Thorold was strictly within his right, but according to the "Church Review,"* his nominee is engaged in the "work of destruction of the souls of the late congregation and the fabric of the Church." Better things than this might have been expected from a paper which is not, like the "Church Times," the organ of that most anomalous political party, the "High Church Radicals."

The "English Churchman" is a highly respectable paper, published at the comparatively high price of threepence, and representing the Anglican party commonly known as the "high and dry." Its leading articles can hardly be described as brilliant,

* "Church Review," March 4, 1881.

but there is a fine old-fashioned "port-winey" flavour about them—if such an expression may be allowed—which is by no means disagreeable. The writers are perfectly satisfied with their position as representatives of the *via media* school. They have no great sympathy with the Ritualists—in fact they distrust them and their works—but at the same time they have an almost equal distaste for the Low Church clergy, and a hatred for Protestant dissenters of every type. Thus, in the number for the 3rd of February last, we find an article on "The Situation," suggested by a letter from Dr. Pusey which had just appeared in the "Times." The concluding sentences define the position of the paper with so much clearness that it is impossible to do better than quote them. After pointing out the difficulties arising from the deficiencies of the Low Church party, and the excesses of the Ritualists, the article calls upon the Anglican bishops "to express clear (*sic*) and without circumlocution, the plain requirements of the Prayer Book . . . which at any rate would secure the support of the great mass of the faithful clergy and laity." The article ends with the following sentences:—

At present a church closed from Sunday to Sunday, or opened for one half-hearted and dismal service, is not only an anachronism, but a breach of Church order and an insult to common sense; while it is equally manifest that a function such as that at St. Alban's, Holborn, is only possible by a non-natural interpretation of the Prayer Book, and by reading back into the Communion office a great deal which, whether wisely or not, was, on well-authenticated occasions, deliberately omitted from it—to say nothing of the insertion of other matters which never found a place in it. Here, we believe, lies the hope of a pacific settlement; not in giving way to either school of extremists, but in levelling up and levelling down until we reach a little nearer to the golden mean which is the Church's praise and glory.

If so eminently respectable an organ of a religious party can have an object of hatred, it must be found in the Protestant dissenter, for whom it would seem that the "English Churchman" entertains feelings very much akin to those with which the typical fine lady of half a century ago regarded a spider or a toad. Unfortunately, the paper, for some reason best known to itself, entertains a similar distaste for the Catholic Church, which it expresses in a manner sometimes gratuitously offensive. In the number already quoted is a paragraph on the Hospital Sunday Fund, which is about as unfair and unjust as anything can be. The opening sentence refers to "the interested and successful efforts of the English Nonconformists, secretly supported . . . by our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, to prevent the introduction of any questions as to religious belief in the approaching census," and the paragraph then goes on to make sneering reference to the fact

that of the £28,000 received at the Mansion House, "only £500 (came) from the Roman Catholics, £2,000 from the Independents, and £1,100 from the Baptists." The reference to the Protestant sects may be left out of the question. At the same time the writer must have known that such a coalition as that which he suggests is impossible; that Catholics have infinitely more to gain than to lose from the diffusion of the truth on these subjects; and, finally, that the collections on Hospital Sunday in London afford no test whatever of the amount of charity bestowed by Catholics on the poor and the suffering.

Unhappily the "English Churchman" appears to delight in ostentatious displays of its Protestant character, which are by no means invariably in the best taste. What can educated and intelligent Englishmen think of such passages as those which we are about to quote, save that, in spite of all the talk of the last few years about the "Catholic" character of the English Establishment, it is still as Protestant as ever, and that the spirit which prevailed in the days of Henry VIII. is, in religious matters, the spirit which prevails to-day? Speaking of the reply of the Catholic archbishops and bishops to Mr. Parnell, the "English Churchman" says:*

. . . . the Irish Roman Catholic Hierarchy, as regards the land agitation, have made up their minds, and they and their flocks will support Mr. Parnell. They may not altogether like him as their leader, but he is in position—therefore the man for the time; and, though nominally a Protestant, he has some special advantages and claims to support. O'Connell was educated by the Jesuits, and altogether a supporter of the Roman Catholic Church far more agreeable to the priests than Mr. Parnell; but O'Connell is not in the field, and they must take what they can get. They are on the whole very well served. The priests and Mr. Parnell are agreed, and it will not be by their consent should order and industry be restored to Ireland.

We turn the page and find a letter copied from that influential organ of public opinion, the "Maidstone and Kentish Journal," on "The Old Catholic Cause in Germany," with which it is needless to say the "English Churchman" is in full sympathy. The style, taste and character of this production may be estimated from a single sentence. "Can any patriotic Englishman, German, or Switzer, consent to accept the re-union of Christendom on the terms of taking his orders from and kissing the toe of an Italian"† The succeeding number of the same journal contains an article on the "Church and Popular Culture," *à propos* of a speech of Bishop Magee of Peterborough, which

* Feb. 24, 1881.

† Ibid.

affords a fair example of the knowledge which the writers in this paper bring to the discussion of matters in which Catholics are concerned. After speaking of the appearance of Monsignor Capel on the platform, the writer goes on to say that "the ordinary Roman priest in this country, trained, it may be, in a foreign seminary, seldom exercises any influence over his flock apart from that of which he is the centre in his purely spiritual capacity."* Of the taste of the conductors of the paper an opinion may be formed from the fact that the number in which the above sapient sentence appears contains an article quoted from the "Record," devoted to violent abuse of the members of the Society of Jesus, on the occasion of their establishing themselves in the Channel Islands after their expulsion from France by the Republican Government.

Of the remaining journals published in the interest of the Anglican Church but little need be said. They are not, perhaps, remarkable for brilliancy or for special ability, but they are not absolutely offensive, and as a rule are marked by a more reverent and charitable spirit than the polemical organs to which reference has just been made. The "Literary Churchman," which appears every alternate Friday, contains articles on the religious questions of the day, which are treated from a stand-point of moderate High Churchmanship, but its main reliance is upon its reviews, which as a rule are full, scholarly and accurate. The subjects treated, it is perhaps hardly necessary to say, are usually those connected with religion and education. The "National Church" is the organ of the Church Defence Association, and is published monthly. Its *raison d'être* is the defence of the Establishment *qua* Establishment against the attacks of those Protestant dissenters who so continually clamour against its pretensions to speak in the name of the nation and to enjoy the endowments which have been placed at its disposal. "Church Bells" is a harmless and well-intentioned little weekly paper of no very marked character, but in many respects more resembling a carefully written tract than anything else—a remark which may be fairly applied to the one paper remaining on the list, the little weekly miscellany called "Hand and Heart," with which the list of Anglican papers, properly so called, closes.

The organs of Protestant dissent—or rather perhaps of political dissent—which come next upon the list, belong to a very different category from those which have just been under consideration. In some of them, at all events, there is very little even of the pretence of religion, and most of them are distinguished by a bitter and intolerant spirit. Of these organs the typical repre-

* "English Churchman," March 3, 1881.

sentative is unquestionably the "Nonconformist," a paper started in 1841 as the organ of those dissenters who "conscientiously" refused to pay Church Rates. Its founder and first editor was the late Mr. Edward Miall, a gentleman who started in life as a dissenting preacher of the Independent—or, as they now prefer to call themselves, "Congregationalist"—sect at the thriving town of Ware in Hertfordshire. In 1841, Mr. Miall, being then in his thirty-second year, abandoned the Congregational ministry, though he continued occasionally to preach in various dissenting chapels until about the year 1852, when he was returned to the House of Commons as member for Rochdale. At the general election of 1857 he was unseated, but when Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country in 1868, he again succeeded in obtaining a seat—this time for Bradford—which he retained until the dissolution in 1874. During the whole of this period he edited the "Nonconformist," and his labours in connection with that journal were so cordially appreciated, that that when it was evident that the fall of Mr. Gladstone's first administration was merely a question of weeks, his admirers raised a sum of no less than 10,000 guineas, which was presented to him at a luncheon at the Crystal Palace on the 18th of July, 1873. It will thus be evident that the paper with which Mr. Miall's name is associated is a representative one in no common degree, and that it may fairly be taken to speak the mind of that middleclass, which according to some fervid orators is the backbone of the nation, and from which the great body of English Dissenters are drawn.

It is hardly necessary to say that the "Nonconformist" is something more than liberal in politics. Mr. Miall was described as "in favour of Manhood Suffrage," and as "utterly opposed to the principle of religious endowments"—though we believe neither he nor his admirers have at any time shown the slightest disposition to surrender the small properties with which the piety of their ancestors has endowed themselves. His opening address laid down the principles of dissent with sufficient clearness. Up to the period when the "Nonconformist" started on its career, dissenters had, he told them, "fought for themselves, rather than for the truth." The time had therefore come when they must "abandon the ground of expediency, and resolutely take up that of principle"—when they must "aim not so much to right themselves, as to right Christianity." When one considers *ex quonam ligno* the average British dissenter is cut, it must be owned that there is something exquisitely ludicrous in the notion of the Christian faith needing to be "righted" by the exertions of the ministers, deacons, and congregations of Salem, and Zion, and Little Bethel. The next line, however, lets the world into the secret. "The union of Church and State is the real evil

against which their efforts must be directed." It was not always thus with the sects. Two centuries earlier, Puritanism had risen in its unloveliness to complete the work begun a century before by the "Reformers," but the votaries of that creed had not the smallest objection to the union of Church and State, or to the possession of endowments. All that they wanted was to have the endowments for themselves, and that obtained they at once laid "heavy burdens and grievous to be borne" upon the people, until the one genius whom Puritanism has produced declared that "new Presbyter was but old priest writ large."

In the earlier days of its career the efforts of the "Nonconformist" were chiefly directed against the imposition of Church Rates. The attack upon Church Rates was, however, only an affair of outposts, and Mr. Miall frankly avowed as much in his opening address. The great object of the Protestant Dissenters is a political one, and few of them now care to disguise the fact. But when the "Nonconformist" first made its appearance it was thought desirable to conciliate the religious Dissenters by the assertion that the policy of the paper was "based upon New Testament principles," which, as interpreted by Mr. Miall, appear to embody the whole Radical programme. First and foremost in the list naturally comes the disestablishment and disendowment of the Established Church, and that end has been steadily kept in view during the whole existence of the "Nonconformist." It cannot be said that the controversy has been waged with any particular fairness or courtesy. At the outset there was a good deal of the disagreeable and untruthful talk about "tithe-fed parsons," "priestism," and similar matters, while the fallacy that endowments bestowed upon the Establishment by private liberality become forthwith "national property," was from the first elevated into an article of faith. In 1865 and 1872 a new system of tactics was adopted. One of the favourite themes for Radical and dissenting declamation is, as every student of the daily press knows full well, the iniquity of "ticketing" the people of this country with their religious belief, by requiring it to be stated in the Census Returns. Why this reluctance should exist in view of the reiterated boasts of their numbers made by Protestant Dissenters it is not very easy to see, but the fact remains, and the censuses of 1861 and 1871 have been—like that of the present year—taken without these important figures. A clumsy attempt was made in 1851 to obtain some idea of the relative numbers of the different sects by counting the congregations, but the figures were notoriously incorrect and untrustworthy, and though Mr. Horace Mann of the Registrar-General's office, duly manipulated them in the interests of the political Dissenters, no weight has at any time been attached to them. In the years above-

mentioned a bright idea seized the conductors of the "Nonconformist." The Dissenters had effectually prevented a really effective and accurate religious census from being taken—why should they not take a census of their own, which might not be perfectly accurate, but would prove by infallible figures the justice of their pretension to speak in the name of the great mass of the people of England? So said, so done. The arrangement was a very simple, and, at the same time a most ingenious one. It consisted simply in taking certain areas, limited in a curiously arbitrary fashion, and counting the number of seats provided within those areas by the Established Church, by Catholics, by Jews, and by Dissenters of every type from Congregationalists and Baptists down to Swedenborgians and Latter-day Saints. The results were supposed to show the relative proportions of the various sects, whilst by contrasting the notoriously doubtful figures of 1851 with those of these manipulated censuses, it was easy to show that the sects had gained much more largely than either the Catholic Church or the Establishment. To do this of course it was necessary to manipulate the figures a good deal, and that was accomplished by taking, in some towns, the Parliamentary Borough, and in others the Municipal Borough, as the area of inquiry, while in cases where the addition of certain suburbs—as at Cardiff—would have materially altered the aspect of affairs, they were carefully left out. If to these facts be added the exaggerations of some figures and the studious understating of others, it will be obvious that these statistics are valuable only for party purposes. So notorious and so monstrous was their false witness, however, that we believe they have never been referred to as authorities, even in the meetings of the "Liberation Society."

In the course of the year 1880 the "Nonconformist" absorbed the "English Independent," for several years the recognized organ of the Congregational body. Notwithstanding this fact, however, it has to a great extent lost the character of a religious newspaper. It records, it is true, the doings of that much be-puffed organization, "The Dissenting Deputies," the meetings of the "Liberation Society," and those of such bodies as the Congregational Chapels Building Society," but there is comparatively little religious intelligence, and the leading articles are not to be distinguished, save perhaps by their acerbity of tone, from those of the secular press. It is hardly necessary to say that it supports Mr. Gladstone with intense ardour, and that it finds abundant reason for satisfaction with the present condition of public affairs.

The Baptist denomination boasts two weekly organs, both of which are published at the price of a penny. The elder is the

"Freeman," which describes itself as a "Journal of Religion, Literature, Social Science, and Politics." It was established at the beginning of 1853, and it advertises itself as "A high-class weekly journal, representing all sections of the Baptist Church." It need not be added that, while its religious influence is chiefly confined to the doings of the sect it represents, its politics are vehemently radical. The tone of the correspondence—much of which turns upon the rite of Baptism as administered in the sect—is often unpleasantly flippant, while the erudite dissensions on the word βαπτίζω do not afford a very high opinion of the scholarship of the sect. The other organ of the Baptists bears the name of the sect as its title, and audaciously takes for its motto the words "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." Considering that in this little sect alone there are, according to the Registrar-General's Returns, no fewer than thirteen sub-divisions—that some are Arians, some Calvinists, some Armenians, some Antinomians, and some observers of the Seventh Day of the week—it might have been thought that the last thing of which Baptists would boast would be their unity. The "Baptist" was projected in 1873, to meet what was then held to be an acknowledged want amongst the members of the denomination. It is, of course, Liberal in politics, but there is very little reference to eternal matters in its columns, the bulk of the space being occupied with reports of sermons, and with the general news of the sect. Considerable space is given to correspondence, the subject lately being, as in the "Freeman," the right form of baptism. It is difficult in the extreme for those outside "the denomination" to understand the importance which the Baptists attach to this matter. No one ever doubted that the βαπτίζω means to "dip" or "plunge under" as the Baptists with a vast show of learning contend; but they cling to their piece of ritual—the only fragment as it would seem which they have left to them—as tenaciously as a High Church curate clings to his chasuble, or an Evangelical minister to his Geneva gown. For the rest, the tone of the paper is at the worst harmless, and if there is something too much about the doings of the Salvation Army, and of the various societies connected with Mr. Spurgeon's tabernacle over against the Elephant and Castle, there is at least a wholesome absence of bigotry and spite which might be imitated with advantage by many more pretentious organs. At the same time it might be as well to suggest to the conductors of the paper, that amongst the duties inculcated upon the early Christians that of courtesy was not forgotten. It is not quite courteous, on the part of the dissidents from the old faith, to speak of Catholics as "Papists" and "Romanists,"

and they may be well assured that there are thousands of people, as non-Catholic as themselves, to whom words like these are needlessly offensive.

Of all the dissenting sects, that of the Methodists is perhaps the most powerful, from the simple fact that it owes its origin to a master of organization. John Wesley was in many ways a genuinely great man. He was curiously narrow-minded; he was grossly superstitious; he was overbearing and autocratic in an extraordinary degree. But he seems to have had an intuitive perception of the needs of his time, and of the proper way in which to encounter them. That time was not ripe for the restoration of Catholic order and of the Catholic faith, but it was quite prepared for the institution of a system which might render something approaching to religion acceptable to the masses of the people, for whom the moribund Establishment had done nothing, or next to nothing, during the whole of the eighteenth century. When Wesley came, with his lean ascetic face and sensational religionism, the common people heard him gladly. All might, however, have been lost, had it not been for the fact that his genius for organization made of the Methodist sect what was practically, so far as this world is concerned, a veritable Church. At the outset the sect was but an off-shoot from the Anglican Establishment, and was—in theory at all events—dependent upon the ministers of that Establishment for everything save those pious exercises of prayer, hymn-singing, and exhortation in which the true-born Methodist delights. Wesley then stepped in, and the system was settled under which the whole body of Methodists was divided into classes. Every member of the sect belonged to a "class": each class had its "class leader," who collected from those under his charge the weekly penny, which was duly handed over to the "superintendent" of the district, and by him transmitted to head-quarters, there to be disposed of according to the orders of the founder of the Society. As a recent writer has remarked "if Louis XIV. could say with truth *L'État c'est moi*, so with even greater accuracy could John Wesley say of the Society which bears his name that it was himself, and that none had the right to interfere with it." That view Wesley maintained, with the result of establishing a body which at the present moment is, next to the Catholic Church, the most powerful in Christendom, especially in the United States. In England the various sects which call themselves after the name of Wesley form a community second in numbers only to the Established Church itself. In America, where for many years Methodism was practically the only religion of the people, the Methodist body is one of the strongest in existence. With its pseudo "bishops," "church officers," "superintendents," "class leaders" and

"pastors," the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States is a body which cannot be left out of account in considering the religious position of the New World.

In England the Methodist body has never attained the proportions of the same Society in the United States, and—as is perhaps not altogether a matter for surprise—Methodism has never obtained a hold upon the educated classes. The very poor who want an emotional religion are sometimes attracted by the forms and the principles of the sect; but the cultured and refined are repelled by its wild enthusiasms and show no anxiety for edification out of the mouths of the inspired cobblers and tinkers who fill the ranks of the Methodist ministry. John Wesley kept himself fairly aloof from this class during his lifetime, but his brother Charles—the "sweet singer" of the sect—lived for many months with an illiterate and fanatical brazier in Little Britain, and his example has been followed by not a few of the later Methodists. The result may be seen in their literature. Methodism is represented in the periodical press by four weekly papers, and it is not saying anything uncharitable to describe these organs as amongst the feeblest, even of the religious newspapers. The oldest of these journals is the "Watchman"—a paper which made its first appearance on the 7th of January, 1835. It was started with the assurance that the profits arising from its sale should be devoted to the support of some public institution. How far this pledge has been redeemed it is of course impossible to say, but in any case the charitable institution in question must have done very well during the last five-and-forty years, since, judging by the advertisements, the "Watchman" is a very satisfactory property, commercially speaking. The principles of the paper may best be judged by a paragraph from the opening address, which will possibly serve better than any elaborate dissertation to explain in the phrase of the great dissenter, John Foster, "the aversion of men of taste to Evangelical religion."

The principles on which this publication will be conducted will be such, as without giving to it a formally theological or religious character, may yet at all times harmonize with the great principles laid down in Holy Scripture, and with the authorized principles and usages of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion. Accordingly, in directing his course, the editor will contemplate as his "cynosure" that moral providence of God by which He governs the nations. While on the one hand it is not to be forgotten that the present is one of those grand climacterics of the world on which important revolutions of opinion, and transitions to new stages of the social state, are found deeply to affect the character and stability of existing institutions. On the other hand, in the conducting of this newspaper, it will be remembered that there

are, after all, in connection with that "kingdom which cannot be moved," principles which, in the best and highest sense, are at the same time *reforming* and *conservative* and which, if need be, will prove to be *resuscitating* also; since, even on the supposition of events the most appalling in prospect to a patriotic mind, they would survive the wreck of civil order, and reorganize society on a permanent foundation. It is not intended to be maintained that the spirit of change, which so strongly marks the present age, is all darkness, and its opposite all light; nor will the desire for legitimate reform be confounded with a passion for lawless revolution. But taking his station on the tower of that heavenly truth, which is perfect and immutable, and thus raised above the tumult of these various conflicts which may at any time distract the public mind, it will be the object of the "Watchman" not only to keep a diligent look-out upon the movements of society, and to make regular and accurate reports of them, but also, on all fair occasions, to interpose among the combatants with "words of truth and soberness," such as may serve to soothe and moderate their spirit; and especially whenever, as appears to be partly the case at present, conflicting parties, weary with contention, languish for repose, it will be his concern to seize the golden opportunity, and to throw off their attention from mere party politics, to things of everlasting and universal obligation. . . . But, in all cases, the principal aim of the journal will be to encourage that moral "preparation of the heart," which is so favourable to a right use of the understanding; and to place all public affairs in that same light in which alone the far less complicated and uncertain interests of private life can be fairly estimated—the clear and solemn light of eternity.

The earlier numbers of the "Watchman" were moderately Conservative in tone, but disfigured by the verbosity and "cant" which mark the passage quoted above. They are, moreover, anything but pleasant reading, from the fact that, at the time when the paper was first started, the Methodist body was in the throes of one of those periodical convulsions which wait like a Nemesis on all sects. Column after column was occupied with the disputes of "Dr. Warren and his party," with complaints against "an individual most falsely styling himself a follower of John Wesley, and who (*sic*) has for years been well known in the Circuit as a promoter of strife and contention both in Church and State, and whose vulgar abuse and outrageous violence towards the Ministers of Christ are such as must make it apparent, even to his own partisans, that he is wholly destitute of that piety to which he has made such high but delusive pretensions." On the other hand, the early numbers of the "Watchman" contain a host of advertisements expressive of the "high sense" which the Methodists of that day entertained for the Rev. Jabez Bunting, for whose "intellectual and moral character, and for the value and disinterestedness of his labours in the cause of Wesleyan Methodism," it would, it appears, be difficult to say

too much. Of the amenities of Protestant controversy, the earlier numbers of the "Watchman" afford some interesting specimens. Of late years it has changed its character to a somewhat remarkable extent. In politics it still professes Liberal-Conservatism, but the former quality is much more conspicuous than the latter; while its religious tendencies are distinctly less sectarian than they were when it first started on its career. It is interesting to note how from time to time even a journal so distinctly Protestant as this, is compelled to admit the power and influence of the Catholic Church. To its credit, it has never joined in the anti-religious warfare which some of the sects have waged during the last half century, and the representatives of the Wesleyan body will usually be found in the same division lobby with Catholics when religious education is under discussion. Latterly this subject has been taken up with considerable energy, and those who care to turn over the files of the "Watchman" will find abundant reason for hopefulness with regard to the future of Wesleyanism. Sectarian though they may be, the followers of John Wesley are very obviously impressed with the fact that Sectarianism pure and simple unquestionably leads to contempt for and defiance of all religion, and that the only hope for religion lies within the fold of the Church. A recent number of this paper contains a letter from Dr. J. H. Rigg, the Principal of the Wesleyan Training College for Elementary Schoolmasters, and a member of the London School Board. This letter is remarkable for the indirect testimony which it affords, first, to the rapidly increasing power and influence of the Church in the United States; and, secondly, to the uneasiness with which Protestants, who are honestly religious view the flood of infidelity which is gradually over-spreading those countries where the principle of authority is condemned, and where "the right of private judgment" is most freely exercised. The official organ of the American Methodist body—the "New York Christian Advocate"—has, it seems, devoted a long article to the religious condition of the city of St. Louis, and Dr. Rigg, from his personal experience, endorses the statements of his American contemporary. It appears that in that city, which numbers 350,000 inhabitants, "Roman Catholicism is the dominant religion;" that the "Unsectarian common Schools of America have become absolutely godless;" that the people of St. Louis have to "submit to a godless system of education controlled and enforced by bar-room politicians, infidels, and atheists," and that "there is not a distinctively Protestant religious school in St. Louis, excepting one little institution belonging to the Episcopalians." Two or three sentences from Dr. Rigg's letter may be added in this place in order to illustrate the charity of Protestant dissenters, and the amenities of controversy as understood by the Wesleyan body.

We have (says the writer) 45,000 in the churches of all denominations, and 120,000 in the saloons on the Sabbath day. Roman Catholicism (he adds) is an angel of mercy as compared with those saloons. . . . With few exceptions the leading churches are huddled together in a small compass in the wealthiest portion of the city. The down-town population is left to the Catholics, the police, and the devil.

One fact only remains to be noticed in connection with the "Watchman," and that is the great number of quack medicine advertisements which adorn its columns. Religious newspapers generally profit by advertisements of this kind, but the "Watchman" is unusually fortunate in securing them.

Another organ of the Wesleyan body is the "Methodist Recorder," a penny sheet, which was started in 1861, with the avowed intention of "presenting, from week to week, a complete body of Wesleyan intelligence." The paper presents few features of special interest. Its terminology is of course that of the sect it represents, and its politics may be concisely described as Gladstonian. Like the "Watchman," it contains a good many advertisements of quack medicines, and it is further distinguished by its custom of printing at length the sermons preached on the occasion of the funerals of conspicuous members of the sect. The "Methodist"—a third journal of the same type—dates from 1874, and is chiefly remarkable for its very aggressive Protestantism. The point aimed at is not very high, and a study of the columns of the paper is not likely to impress the reader with a very exalted opinion of the intellectual capacity of the modern Methodist. Much the same verdict will probably be given by the majority of readers with reference to the remaining Methodist publication on our list—the "Primitive Methodist." As its name imports, this is the organ of that sect of the Methodist body which is most addicted to the practice of those extravagances which have brought it into disrepute with sober-minded and reasonable people. It is hardly necessary to say that it is intensely Protestant in tone, or that in politics it is as ardently Radical. If the Church is mentioned, it is always in terms which imply that the enlightened Primitive Methodists consider her as on a level with the heathen; while if the Conservative party or the House of Lords comes into question it is always with expressions which appear to be borrowed from the vocabulary of those Sunday papers which are the discredit of English journalism.

The most remarkable of the religious newspapers is, however, the "War Cry"—the organ of that "Salvation Army" whose erratic doings not unfrequently bring them into more or less violent collision with the police, and with the populace of our large towns. The social position of these persons maybe estimated from two

facts: one that their head-quarters are in the not very savoury region of the Whitechapel Road; the other that, like the secret societies of Foresters, Buffaloes, Odd Fellows, and their kindred, they appear to take an immense delight in absurd titles, and in the wearing of uniforms and decorations. The kind of religion which is preached by the leaders of this singular organization may be readily comprehended by the study of a few numbers of its favoured organ. In the first place the hierophants of the sect appear to lay great stress on their having been originally persons of very bad character, and at best of the lowest rank in life. Each number of the "War Cry" contains the portrait and biography of one of the leaders of the movement, and during the first three months of the present year the personages thus commemorated have been as follows: Abraham Davey, an agricultural labourer, educated as a Protestant dissenter of some unspecified type; Henry Reed, of Launceston, Tasmania, who, if not a convict, seems as though he ought to have been one; Tom Payne, a "converted pot-boy;" "Captain (Mother) Shepherd," born a Baptist and utterly without education, who lived a vicious life for many years until "converted" by the preaching of "Dowdle, the converted railway guard;" "Captain" George Taberer, the converted drunkard; "Captain" Polly Parks, an ex-nursery maid; "Captain" Thomas Estill, an ex-seaman, not wholly unknown to the police; "Captain" Roe, the converted horse-jockey; "Captain" Wilson, the reformed Manchester drunkard; "Captain" Hanson, a foremast man, who appears to have been the most respectable of the party; and, lastly, "Mrs. Captain" Howe, apparently an ex-maid-servant. The second point about these worthy people is, that, apart from their fantastic designations as members of the "Salvation Army," they are extremely fond of adopting fancy titles and eccentric signatures. Thus, in the number of the "War Cry" for the 13th of January there is a letter, the signature to which is literally as follows; "Private W. Stephens, the blood-washed coachman of the Stroud Corps." In that for the 3rd of February is a piece of Welsh poetry, which is signed "William Davies, the happy Welshman," and similarly eccentric signatures may be found in every number.

A third point which will strike the dispassionate reader of this paper is the astonishingly free-and-easy way in which the "Salvation Army" deal with matters of which commonplace Christians speak, if not "with bated breath and whispering humbleness," with at least reverence and humility. Richter is said to have remarked that no man could be described as truly religious who was not on such friendly terms with his religion that he could make a joke of it. Whether the saying was not in itself a somewhat indifferent jest may be open to question. At

the same time, it is beyond question that the "hot-gospellers" of the Salvation Army talk about the most sacred things with an irreverence which can only be described as shocking. No small amount of space is taken up with pious parodies of popular songs. "Rule Britannia" becomes "Rule Emanuel:"—

When Christ the lord at God's command,
In love, came down to save the lost,
The choir of heaven, with golden harps,
Praised Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

CHORUS.

Rule Emanuel, Emanuel rules the waves.
Christians never shall be slaves.

The "Blue Bells of Scotland" is distorted into a hymn beginning—

Oh, where! and, oh where can I now a Saviour find?

"Weel may the keel row" becomes the "Newcastle Anthem"—

Oh, we're all off to glory, from glory to glory,
We are all off to glory, to make the heavens ring.

And so forth. The specimens already given will show pretty clearly the type of literature represented by the "War Cry." The news is given in paragraphs of the same character. We quote one which has for head-line: "SHEERNESS. *Major Moore to the front. All night with Jesus.*

Our Chatham comrades ran over, and the salvation jockey and his lieutenant gave some soul-stirring speeches. We could see that many were too badly wounded to get over it without going to the Great Physician. But the meeting that followed, called "an all-night with Jesus," beggared description. From one to two o'clock Tuesday morning there could not have been less than 100 souls (saints and sinners) struggling and wrestling with the Lord, who had promised a clean heart. For about half-an-hour we felt we were in Heaven; the Spirit of God was upon us. . . . We do want a barracks of our own. Will not some one who loves God and souls send Captain Davey a good donation towards one. The Almighty pays 100 per cent. for all that is given out of pure love to Him. Send it along.

The appeal with which this paragraph closes is eminently characteristic of the paper in which it appears. The begging is constant, and apparently very successful. By the figures which are published from week to week, it would seem that the circulation of the "War Cry" is about 5,000, and the leader of the movement acknowledges from week to week contributions of from

£20 to £50. Where the balance-sheets are to be seen is not stated, nor is the total of each week's contributions given; but we have, instead, a strenuous protest against unprincipled imitators who—in the words of the cheap tailors—"are guilty of the untradesmanlike falsehood of representing themselves as the same concern"—:

In reply to numerous inquiries, we desire it to be distinctly understood that we have nothing whatever to do with the American Christian Army, or the Christian Army, or the Gospel Army, or the Christian Mission Army (neither at Ripley or Castleford).

And we will not be held responsible in any way for the debts or doings of either of these societies, or any other imitation.

We have no connexion with persons styling themselves the Hallelujah Army in Ireland or elsewhere, and invite information of persons stating they are in connexion with us.

The interests of the Presbyterians are cared for in the "*Weekly Review*," a four-penny journal of moderately Liberal politics which dates from the spring of 1862. As a matter of course, the greater part of the space in this paper is occupied by the doings of the body in whose name it speaks, but some portion of it is reserved for leading articles and for occasional poetry of a somewhat advanced type of Protestantism. There is a fine intolerance about some of these productions which is very characteristic of the country of John Knox, while the terminology is exactly what might be expected amongst people who have put what they call "Sabbath-keeping" in the place of almost all religious duties, and who have substituted the hearing of polemical sermons for the duty of Christian worship. The spirit of the following piece of verse is worthy of the Covenanters themselves:—

BRITISH LAW MUST CONTROL OUR PAPAL PRIESTS.*

If any Papal Cleric be inclined
To show his canine teeth, no man, I hope,
Would urge our Government to tell the Pope
That such a snarler ought to be confined.
What! shall we miserably creep behind
The Papal petticoat, and scream "Ahoy!
Good mother, rid me from that naughty boy!"
For shame, is that the measure of your mind!
Our ruling men must manage our affair,
And not go whining to a foreign priest;
When any double-dealing knave will dare
To violate our statutes in the least,
Let him be put beneath the judge's care,
And dealt with so that truth may be increased.

* "*Weekly Review*," March 12, 1881.

The expression of these lines might perhaps be improved, but there is no possibility of misunderstanding the spirit which dictates them, and that spirit, it is lamentable to say, pervades the entire paper.

The Unitarian "Inquirer" is a paper of a very different type. Its tone is almost ostentatiously tolerant, and there is a superciliousness about its leading articles which, to the non-Unitarian mind, is sometimes intensely exasperating. At the same time it must be admitted that there is an air of culture about the paper, which is by no means frequently to be met with in the organs of the dissenting sects.

Of the other religious papers—so-called—it is not necessary to say much. Quakerism boasts a couple of organs in the weekly press—the "British Friend" and the "Friend—but neither of them presents any very salient features. The Hebrew community are also represented by two newspapers, the "Jewish Chronicle" and the "Jewish World," two journals which serve, if they serve no other purpose, to prove that the people of what it is the fashion to call "the ancient faith" have hardly altered in about two thousand years, and that there are amongst them a quite sufficient number of those *qui negant esse resurrectionem*. These papers are, however, of very small interest as compared with those which describe themselves as "unsectarian," and which are carried on in the interests of the dissenting sects. A writer in "Macmillan's Magazine" recently described these organs at some length, and it would be difficult to add much to his account of them. The "Christian World," the "Christian," the "Christian Herald," and the "Fountain," appear to be written by dissenting ministers of the lower type—and what they are Mrs. Oliphant has told the world once for all in her inimitable novels, "Salem Chapel" and "Phœbe Junior"—for the edification of the young ladies and gentlemen of a "serious" turn of mind, who serve behind the counters of the shops in provincial towns, and who form the back-bone of the congregations of the dissenting chapels in the provinces. The stories which they contain are somewhat dull, and the articles which adorn them are not, as a rule, of a kind to attract people of refined taste, but there is an abundance of sectarian spite and jealousy, which, it is not unfair to suppose, makes up for deficiencies in other respects. Two points only remain to be noticed. The first is, that these papers appear, as a rule, to live by the advertisements of quack medicines, quack tea, quack jewellery, and quack pictures; the second, that the most widely-circulated of all—or at all events the one which professes to enjoy the widest circulation—is given up to speculations on the prophecies of the Old Testament and the Apocalypse. Of these matters it requires a certain sense of humour to speak

with temper. When, however, we find a "clergyman of the Church of England"—whose name, by the way, does not appear in the "Clergy List"—complacently predicting the destruction of the world as imminent on the strength of his reading of certain passages in the prophecies of Daniel, and talking with similar complacency of the "followers of the Scarlet Woman of Babylon," our laughter is apt to have a rather sardonic quality about it. Nor, in view of the fact that those who believe in the peculiar theology of these journals are amongst the most devout of Sabbatarians, is it possible to regard with entire complacency the trivial circumstance that one at least of them is openly sold on Sundays within the walls of that "Temple" of which its editor is the hierophant.

On the whole, a survey of the so-called religious press of England is not flattering to the national pride. Amongst the organs of the Establishment may be found the representatives of the half dozen sects into which that body is divided; but in no one is it possible to discover that Catholic spirit which it was the hope of the Tractarians of 1830 to revive. The Low Church party appear to delight in journals whose actual *raison d'être* is their opposition to the Catholic faith, and which in their violent Protestantism not unfrequently lose sight of the decencies of controversy. The papers which represent the interests of Protestant dissent are not much wiser or less virulent; whilst some of them are, as a matter of fact, examples of what journalism should not be. Yet these are papers of the widest circulation; and it is to their readers and supporters that is now committed the final decision of all matters concerning the real government of the country.



ART II.—THE EXTENT OF FREE WILL.

WE need not, we hope, remind our readers that our present succession of articles has for its purpose the establishing securely on argumentative ground—particularly against contemporary Antitheists—the Existence of that Personal and Infinitely Perfect Being, whom Christians designate by the name "God." Hardly any premiss (we consider) is more effective for this conclusion, than the existence of Free Will in man, as irrefragably proved by reason and experience. We have accordingly been proceeding of late with a series bearing on this particular theme. We drew out, in April, 1874, our general line of argument on the subject; and we examined

successfully (pp. 347-360) all the objections against Free Will which we could find adduced by Mr. Stuart Mill and by Dr. Bain. Dr. Bain replied to this article: and we rejoined in April, 1879; adding some supplementary remarks in October of the same year. Dr. Bain briefly returned to the controversy in the *Mind* of January, 1880, and we answered him in the April number of the same periodical: * nor (as he informs us in a most courteous private letter) does he intend to continue the controversy further. In the April number of *Mind* there also appeared an elaborate criticism of our whole argument, from the pen of Mr. Shadworth Hodgson; which we answered at length in our number of last October. Mr. Hodgson briefly replied in the *Mind* of last January, and we are quite willing to leave him the last word for the present. More than one Catholic of weight has expressed to us a wish that we would press on more rapidly with the general chain of our Theistic argument; and we would defer, therefore, our reply to our last opponent, till the chain is completed. Meanwhile we can desire nothing better, than that fair-minded and impartial thinkers shall judge for themselves, how far anything now said by Mr. Hodgson tends to invalidate the arguments we had adduced for our own conclusion.

The ground we have taken up (as our readers will remember) has been this. Determinists maintain, that the same uniformity of sequence proceeds in the phenomena of man's will, which otherwise prevails throughout the phenomenal world; that every man, at every moment, by the very constitution of his nature, infallibly and inevitably elicits that particular act, to which the entire circumstances of the moment (external and internal) dispose him. We have argued in reply, that,—whereas undoubtedly each man during far the greater part of his waking life is conscious of a “spontaneous impulse,” which is due to his entire circumstances of the moment, and results infallibly therefrom—he finds himself by experience nevertheless able again and again to *resist* that impulse. He is able, we say, to put forth at any given moment what we have called “anti-impulsive effort;” and to elicit again and again some act indefinitely different from that to which his spontaneous impulse solicits him.

Here our position stands at present; and it contains all which is necessary, in order that the fact of Free Will may possess its due efficiency in our argument for Theism. Nevertheless, in order to complete the scientific treatment of Free Will, a supplementary question of great importance has to be con-

* This paper was appended to the DUBLIN REVIEW of July, 1880.

sidered: a question, moreover, which Dr. Bain expressly challenged us to face. During how large a period of the day, in what acts, under what conditions, is any given human being able to exercise this gift of Free Will? And we are the rather called on not to shrink from this question, because the very course of reasoning which we have been obliged to adopt against the Determinists,—unless it be further developed and explained—might be understood (we think) to favour a certain tenet, with which we have no sympathy whatever: a tenet, which we cannot but regard as erring gravely against reason, against sound morality, and against Catholic Theology. The tenet to which we refer is this: that my will is only free at those particular moments when, after expressly debating and consulting with myself * as to the choice I should make between two or more competing alternatives, I make my definite resolve accordingly. This tenet is held (we incline to think) more or less consciously by the large majority of non-Catholic Libertarians; and even many a Catholic occasionally uses expressions and arguments, of which we can hardly see how they do not imply it. Now we are especially desirous that *Catholics* at all events shall see the matter in (what we must account) its true light. Our present article then may in some sense be called intercalary. We shall not therein be addressing Determinists at all, or proceeding in any way with our assault on Antitheism; except of course so far as such assault is indirectly assisted by anything which promotes philosophical unanimity and truth among the body of orthodox believers. It is Catholics alone whom we shall directly and primarily address; and indeed—as regards the theological reasoning which will occupy no very small portion of our space—we cannot expect it of course to have any weight *except* with Catholics. But we hope (as we proceed) to deal with each successive question on the ground of philosophical, no less than theological, argument. Nor will our philosophical arguments imply any other controverted philosophical doctrines, except only those which we consider ourselves to have established in our previous articles. We consider, therefore, that our reasoning has a logical claim on the attention—not of Catholics only—but of those non-Catholics also, who are at one with us on the existence of Free Will and on the true foundation of Ethical Science. Still (as we have said) our direct and primary concern will be throughout with Catholics.

The tenet which we desire to refute (as we have already

* We purposely avoid the word "deliberating," because it has led (we think) to much confusion of thought.

explained) is this: that a man is only free at that particular moment when—after expressly debating and consulting with himself as to the choice he shall make between two or more competing alternatives—he makes his definite resolve in one or other direction. The thesis which we would oppose to this (as we said in answer to Dr. Bain's inquiry) may be expressed with sufficient general accuracy by affirming, that each man is free during pretty nearly the whole of his waking life. The controversy, which may be raised between these two widely different views, is our direct controversy on the present occasion; and the thesis we have just named is our direct thesis. But it will be an absolutely necessary preliminary task, to exhibit (what we may call) a map of man's moral nature and moral action. This preliminary task will occupy half of our article; and when it is finished, we shall have gone (we consider) considerably more than half way towards the satisfactory exposition and defence of our direct thesis itself. Moreover, we hope that this preliminary inquiry will be found by our readers to possess some interest, even apart from the conclusion for the sake of which we introduce it. It will be necessary indeed to discuss incidentally one or two points, which have been warmly debated in the schools; and we have need, therefore, at starting to solicit the indulgence of our readers, for any theological error into which we may unwarily fall. At the same time we shall do our very best to avoid any such error. And at all events we shall confidently contend in due course, that as regards the direct point at issue—the extent of Free Will—we are substantially following the unanimous judgment of standard Catholic theologians. Without further preface then, we embark on our preliminary undertaking.

I. We begin with the beginning. It is held as a most certain truth by all Libertarians, both Catholic and other, that no human act of this life can be formally either virtuous or sinful—can be worthy either of praise or blame—unless it be a *free* act; and only so long as it *continues* free. On this truth we have spoken abundantly on earlier occasions, and here need add no more. Whenever, therefore, in the earlier part of this article, we speak of acts as “virtuous” or “sinful”—we must always be understood as implying the hypothesis, that they are at the moment free. How far this hypothesis coincides with fact—how large a part of human voluntary action is really free—this is the very question on which, before we conclude, we are to set forth and defend what we account true doctrine. Meanwhile let it be distinctly understood, that where there is no liberty, acts may be “materially” virtuous or

sinful; but they cannot be "formally" so, nor deserve praise or blame.

II. "Nemo intendens ad malum operatur." There is no attractiveness whatever to any one in wrongdoing *as such*; no human being does—or from the constitution of his nature can—do wrong, precisely because it is wrong. This is the absolutely unanimous doctrine of Catholic theologians and philosophers. It deserves far fuller exposition than we have here space to give it; but a very few words will suffice to show, how clearly experience testifies its certain and manifest truth. Take the very wickedest man in the whole world, and get him to fix his thoughts carefully on such topics as these: "How exquisitely base and mean to ruin the friend that trusts me!" "How debasing, polluting and detestable is the practice of licentiousness!" "How odious and revolting are acts of envy and malignity!" Will it be found that such considerations spur him on to evil actions? that the baseness, meanness, odiousness of an evil action is an additional motive to him for doing it? On the contrary, he knows to the very depth of his heart how fundamentally different is his moral constitution. He knows very well that, if he could only be got to dwell on such a course of thought as we have just suggested, he would assuredly be reclaimed; and for that very reason he entirely refuses to ponder on the wickedness of his acts. It is their pleasurable, not their wickedness, which stimulates him to their performance.

III. Accordingly, it is the universal doctrine of Catholic theologians and philosophers, that all ends of action which men can possibly pursue are divisible into three classes: "bonum honestum;" "bonum delectabile;" "bonum utile." Let us explain what we understand by this statement. Virtuousness*—pleasurable—utility—these are the only three ends, which men can possibly pursue in any given action. Whatever I am doing at any particular moment, I am doing either (1) because I account it "virtuous" so to act; or (2) because I seek "pleasurable" in so acting; or (3) because I regard the act as "useful," whether to the end of virtuousness or of pleasurable; or (4) from an intermixture of these various motives. This is plainly the case: because I have not so much as the physical power of doing what is wicked *because* it is wicked; and the only motive therefore, which can possibly

* For our own part—and with great deference to those excellent and thoughtful Catholics who think otherwise—the more we reflect, the more confidently we hold that "virtuousness" is an entirely simple idea. We argued for this conclusion—which to us seems a vitally important one—in January, 1880.

prompt my wrong action, is the pleasurable-ness which I thence expect to derive.

Or let us put the same truth in a different shape. My "absolute" end* of action must in every case—by the very necessity of my mental constitution—be either virtuousness, or pleasurable-ness, or the two combined: but there are various "intermediate" ends at which I may aim, as being "useful" to the attainment of my "absolute" ends.

At the same time it is abundantly clear on a moment's consideration, that if this division is to be exhaustive—under the term "pleasurable-ness" must be included, not bodily pleasurable-ness alone, but intellectual, æsthetical, or any other: the delight of reading a beautiful poem, or of gazing on sublime scenery, or of grasping a mathematical, philosophical, or theological demonstration. Then again the malignant, the envious, the revengeful person finds delight in the sufferings of his fellow-men. Lastly, it is further clear, that "pleasurable-ness" includes very prominently "negative" pleasurable-ness—viz., the escape from pain, grief, ennui.

We have spoken on an *intermixture* of ends; but a few more words must be added to elucidate that subject. On some occasion, under circumstances entirely legitimate, I largely assist some one who has fallen under heavy misfortune. Let us first suppose, that I do this exclusively because I recognise how virtuous it is to render such assistance. Yet the act may cause me intense pleasure—the pleasure of gratifying my compassion—because of God's merciful dispensation, which has so largely bound up pleasurable-ness with the practice of virtue. So far is clear. But now it is abundantly possible—indeed it probably happens in a very large number of cases—that this pleasurable-ness may be part of the very end which motives my external act. If this be so, the more convenient and theologically suitable resource is (we think) to account the will's movement as consisting of two different simultaneous acts. Of these two acts, the one is directed to virtuousness, to pleasurable-ness the other: the one (as will be seen in due course) is virtuous; the other (as will also be seen) *may* indeed be inordinate and so sinful, but *need* not be sinful at all.

Something more should also be said on that special end of action, virtuousness. It is laid down by various theologians (see Suarez, "de Gratia," l. 12, c. 9, n. 1; Mazzella, "De Virtutibus Infusis," n. 1335) that acts truly virtuous, though

* We purposely avoid saying "ultimate" end; because we are inclined to think that much confusion has arisen from the different senses which have been given to the term "*finis ultimus*."

done without thought or even knowledge of God, are referred to Him nevertheless "innately," "connaturally," "by their own weight." And Suarez gives a reason for this ("De Ultimo Fine," d. 3, s. 6, n. 6). Such an act, he says, is pleasing to God; and is *capable* of being referred to Him, even though in fact not so referred.* This explanation must be carefully borne in mind; because otherwise various theological statements, on the obligation of referring human acts to God, might be importantly misunderstood. Then—going to another particular—S. Thomas (e.g. 2^a 2^{ae} q. 23 a. 7, c.) speaks of virtuousness as "*verum bonum*," in contrast with "*bonum apparens*." He contrasts again "*bonum incommutabile*" with "*bonum commutabile*:" a matter on which much amplification might be given, had we the space.

Here, moreover—to avoid serious misconception—we must carefully consider the particular case of what may be called "felicific" possessions. There is a large number of such possessions, which it is entirely virtuous and may sometimes even be a duty for me to pursue or desire, not as means to any ulterior end, but simply as an integral portion of my happiness.† So theologians speak of "*caritas egra nos*" "*amor nostri*"—either of which phrases we may translate "self-charity"—as designating one particular virtue: the virtue of promoting my own true happiness. Immeasurably the foremost, among these possible felicific possessions, stands (we need hardly say) my own permanent happiness, considered as a whole and not as confined to its earthly period. But there are very many others also. Such are, e.g., my permanent earthly happiness; bodily health; equable spirits; competent temporal means; happy family and social relations; a good reputation among my fellow-men; a sufficient supply of recreations and amusements; intellectual power; poetical taste; sufficient scope for the exercise of such power and such taste, and generally for what modern philosophers call "self-development;" &c. &c. Now as regards all these, except the first, it appertains no doubt to higher perfec-

* See also d. 2, s. 4, n. 5.

† We here use the word "happiness" and its co-relative "felicific," in what we take to be its ordinary use throughout non-theological writings. Theologians no doubt—as we shall explain in due course—use the word "felicitas" in a fundamentally different sense. But we suppose that, in ordinary parlance, "my own happiness" always means "my own sum of enjoyment." No doubt the word suggests far more prominently the higher, more subtle, more mental sources of enjoyment, than those which are lower and more animal; but the probable reason of this is, that cultured persons—who in the last resort fix linguistic usage—recognise the former class as being indefinitely more pervasive, permanent, satisfying, than the latter.

tion (as Suarez observes*) that a man desire them only so far as they may be instruments of virtue. Still they may virtuously be loved and (if so be) pursued for no ulterior end, but merely as constituent parts of my happiness, and as the objects of self-charity. Yet it might appear on the surface that, in pursuing my own happiness, I cannot conceivably be aiming at any other end, except that of mere *pleasurableness*; and this is a misconception, which it is important to clear up. A very few words will enable us to do so.

Let us take, as a particular instance, the blessing of health. I am lying on my sick-bed in pain of body and depression of mind. I recognise that I may quite virtuously aim at the recovery of my health—not merely as a means for more effectually serving God, or more successfully gaining my own livelihood, or the like,—but simply as an integrating part of my happiness. Accordingly I pursue this virtuous end of self-charity. As a matter of conscience, I adopt regularly the prescribed remedies, however distasteful at the moment; and I fight perseveringly against my natural tendency towards availing myself of those immediate gratifications, which may retard my recovery. What is my end in such acts? Precisely the *virtuousness* which I recognise to exist, in pursuing health as an integral part of my earthly happiness. I am grievously tempted, for the gratification of present (negative) pleasurableness, to neglect my more permanent happiness: and I recognise it as virtuous to resist such gratification. It is extremely probable indeed that these acts, directed to virtuousness, will be simultaneously accom-

* In the Foundation of the Exercises “such indifference of affection is recommended towards created things not prohibited, as that we should not rather seek health than sickness, nor prefer a long life to a short one. But at once this objection occurs—viz., that health and life are among those things, which a man is bound by precept to preserve and seek by such methods as are virtuous and becoming. Consequently [so the objection proceeds] such indifference is not *laudable*, as would be exhibited in not seeking health rather than sickness.

[Reply.] “The good of life and [again] of health is no doubt among those things, which may be desired for their own sake; that is, as being of themselves suitable to nature and necessary to a certain integrity thereof, for the sake of which [integrity] they are virtuously desired without relation to any ulterior end. Therefore a man’s affections may, without any sin, not be entirely indifferent concerning those goods considered in themselves. Nevertheless it appertains to *greater perfection*, that we love not these goods except as they are instruments of virtue. . . . And the same thing may be said concerning all those goods which are such that, though they may be rightly loved for their own sake, nevertheless a man has it in his power to make a good or bad use of them. For in regard to *virtues*—of which a man *cannot* make a bad use—such indifference is not laudable.”—SUAREZ, *De Religione Societatis Jesu*, l. 9, c. 5, n. 11.

panied by other acts, tending to (negative) pleasurable-ness as their end; wherein I eagerly desire to be free from all this suffering and weariness of soul. But this is no more than a phenomenon, which (as we just now explained) continually occurs in the case of other virtuous acts, and is by no means confined to these acts of self-charity. Now, however, take an opposite picture. In my state of sickness I am a very slave to (negative) pleasurable-ness; I give myself up without restraint to my present longing for escape from my present anguish; I wantonly retard my recovery, by shrinking from immediate pain; I do nothing on principle, but everything on impulse. Here certainly none of my acts are directed to virtuousness, but all to (negative) pleasurable-ness. There is this fundamental and most unmistakable contrast between the two cases. In the former, the thought that I act *virtuously* by aiming at my recovery is constantly in my mind, prompting me to correspondent action; whereas in the latter case such thoughts of virtuousness are only conspicuous by their absence. And exactly the same kind of contrast may be shown, as regards my method of pursuing those other felicitic possessions which admit of being pursued at all. Moreover, it should not be forgotten, that my desire itself of a felicitic possession may very easily indeed become inordinate and therefore sinful: as will be explained towards the conclusion of our article.

IV. We have been speaking of those ends, at which a human being can aim. It is plain, however, that an end, which has once been "explicitly" intended, may continue vigorously to influence my will, though it is no longer explicitly in my mind. When such is the fact, theologians say that it is "virtually" pursued. And the fact here noted is of such very pervasive importance in the whole analysis of man's moral action, that we are most desirous of placing it before our readers as emphatically and as accurately as we can. Let us give then such an illustration as the following. I start for the neighbouring town on some charitable mission; and (as it happens) there are a great many different turns on my road, which I am quite as much in the habit of taking, as that particular path which leads me securely to the town. I have not proceeded more than a very little way, before my mind becomes so engaged with some speculative theme, that I entirely lose all explicit remembrance of the purpose with which I set out. Nevertheless, on each occasion of choice, I pursue my proper path quite as a matter of course, and so arrive safely at my journey's end. It is very plain, then, that my original end has in fact been influencing me throughout; for how otherwise can we possibly account for the fact, that in every single instance I have chosen the one right

course? Will you say that my *habit* of going to the town accounts for it? Not at all; because we have supposed that there is no one of the alternative paths which I have not been quite as much in the habit of pursuing as that which leads to the town. My original end then has motivated my act of walking quite as truly and effectively, after I have ceased explicitly to think about that end, as it did when it was most conspicuously present on the very surface of my mind. But, whereas, during the first few minutes of my walk, my pursuit of that end was "explicit"—during the later period it has been changed from "explicit" into "virtual."

So much on the word "virtual." Dr. Walsh, the President of Maynooth, in his recent work "*De Actibus Humanis*" (nn. 71-81),* most serviceably recites the various psychological theories adopted by various Catholic theologians for the elucidation of this term. He thus, however, sums up (n. 81) the conclusions on which all are agreed: "An intention," they say, "which has previously been elicited, inflows 'virtually' into, the [subsequent] action, so long as the agent, being *sui compos* and acting humanly—although he be not [explicitly]† thinking of his previous intention—nevertheless is in such disposition of mind, that (if asking himself or asked by others what he is doing, and why) he would at once [supposing him rightly to understand what passes in his mind]‡ allege his previous intention, and answer: 'I do this for the sake of that.'" Elsewhere (n. 669)

* If it be not impertinent for one in our position to express even a favourable judgment on the labours of such an authority, we would say how inestimably valuable this volume appears to us. Extremely valuable for its own sake, when we consider how full it is both of unusual learning and singularly fresh and independent thought; but still more valuable, as an augury of more extended treatment being hereafter given to the "*De Actibus*," than has in recent times been the case. It has always seemed to us a very unfortunate circumstance, that the "*De Actibus*" has of late been exclusively treated as a part of Moral Theology. We would submit that its dogmatic importance also, as introductory to the "*De Gratia*," is very great. But a result (we think) of the circumstance to which we are adverting, has been that those portions of the treatise, which are not wanted for the Confessional, have been left unduly in the back-ground.

We hope largely to avail ourselves of Dr. Walsh's labours in what follows. And we would also do what we can towards drawing attention to three papers on "Probabilism," from the same writer's pen, which appeared last autumn in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. We should venture to describe them as forming quite an epoch in the study of Moral Theology.

† We add the word "explicitly" because Dr. Walsh avowedly includes Lugo's theory in his summary; and Lugo holds that in all such cases there is *implicit* thought of the end previously intended.

‡ We add this qualification on our own responsibility.

Dr. Walsh quotes with approval, from S. Bonaventure, an equally excellent definition. "Acts," says the Saint, "are then said to be 'virtually' referred" to some end, "when the preceding intention" of pursuing that end "is the true cause of those works which are afterwards done."

As to the psychological theories recited by Dr. Walsh—with very sincere deference to his judgment, we cannot ourselves but adhere to Lugo's, which he rejects in n. 77. That great theologian holds, that whenever the "virtual" intention of some end motives my action, an "actual" intention thereof is really present in my mind, though but implicitly. And we would submit that the very definition of the word "virtual," given by Dr. Walsh, substantiates the accuracy of this analysis. Take an instance. I foresee that in half an hour's time I shall very probably be disappointed of some enjoyment, which I earnestly desire. I well know how grievous is my tendency to lose my temper under such a trial; and accordingly I at once resolve to struggle vigorously against this tendency should the occasion arrive. This resolve is founded on some given virtuous motive, or assemblage of virtuous motives; in order to fix our ideas, let us suppose that it is founded exclusively on my pondering the virtuousness of *patience*. The occasion does arrive in due course; and my previous explicit intention now "virtually" influences my successful resistance to temptation. It is Lugo's doctrine, that (supposing such to be the case) my will is *now* influenced by the virtuousness of patience, no less really and genuinely than it was half-an-hour ago when I made my holy resolve. The only difference (he considers) between the two cases is, that then I thought of that virtuousness "explicitly," whereas now I do but think of it "implicitly." This conclusion seems to us certainly true; and we would thus argue in its favour.

Dr. Walsh lays down as the unanimous judgment of theologians, that (in the supposed circumstances) if I ask myself *why* I resist the temptation, my true answer will be, "I do this for the sake of that:" or, in other words, "I resist the temptation, for the sake of carrying out my previous resolve." But my previous resolve was (by hypothesis) founded exclusively on the virtuousness of patience; and therefore my present resistance is founded on the self-same motive. That motive was then indeed present to my mind explicitly, and now it is present no more than implicitly. But the motive of action in either case must surely be the very same.

Or, take S. Bonaventure's explanation of the word "virtual." The preceding resolve, he says, has been "the true cause" of my present action. But who will say that my explicit resolve to practise one given virtue has (when occasion arises) been

the "true cause" of my practising, *not* that virtue, but some other?*

We do not deny that, according to Lugo's doctrine, a "virtual" intention may very frequently motive an act, without having been preceded by a corresponding "explicit" intention at all. But we do not see any difficulty in this conclusion. And indeed we should point out that, for our own purpose, the preceding paragraphs have not been strictly necessary. If indeed we were building on theological statements concerning "virtual intention," it would be strictly necessary to inquire what theologians *mean* by that term. But our own argument is logically untouched, if we simply say that (in what follows) we ourselves at least shall consistently use the term "virtual intention," as simply synonymous with "implicit."

We wish we had space to pursue this whole theme of "virtual" or "implicit" intention, at a length worthy of its pre-eminent importance; but we must find space for an illustrative instance. Some considerable time ago men of the world were in the habit of using much indecent language in mutual conversation: while nevertheless they thought it thoroughly ungentlemanly so to speak in the presence of ladies. We will suppose two gentlemen of the period to be talking with each other, while some lady is in the room, occupied (we will say) in writing a letter. They are wholly engrossed, so far as they are themselves aware, with the subject they are upon; politics, or the Stock Exchange, or sporting. They are not explicitly thinking of the lady at all; and yet, if they are really gentlemen, her presence exercises on them a most real and practical influence. It is not that they fall into bad language and then apologize; on the contrary, they are so restrained by her presence that they do not dream of such expressions. Yet, on the other hand, no one will say that the freedom of their thought and speech is explicitly perceived by them to be interfered with. Their careful abstinence then from foul language is due indeed to an intention actually present in their mind; the intention, namely, of not distressing the lady who is present. Yet this intention is entirely implicit; and they will not even become aware of its existence, except by means of careful introspection. And this, we would submit (if we may here anticipate our coming argument), is that kind of practical remembrance and impression concerning God's intimate presence, which it is of such singular importance that I preserve through the day. What I need (we say) is a practical remembrance and impression,

* In which of its many senses S. Bonaventure here uses the word "cause," there is no need to inquire.

which shall really inflow into my thoughts and powerfully influence them ; while nevertheless it shall be altogether implicit, and shall therefore in no perceptible degree affect my power of applying freely and without incumbrance to my various duties as they successively occur. And this indeed is surely the very blessing which a Catholic supplicates, when he prays each morning that "a pure intention may sanctify his acts of the day."

But this very prayer itself is sometimes perverted into what we must really call a mischievous superstition. A certain notion seems more or less consciously to be in some persons' minds, of which it is absolutely necessary to show the entire baselessness, if we would exhibit a conspectus of man's moral action with any kind of intelligibleness and availableness. The Catholic is taught to pray in the morning that a pure intention may sanctify his actions of the day as they successively take place. But a notion seems here and there to exist, that these successive actions have *already* been sanctified by *anticipation*, in his morning oblation of them. This strange notion assumes two different shapes, and issues accordingly in one or other of two importantly distinct tenets. One of these tenets we will at once proceed to consider ; while the other will find a fit place for discussion a few pages further on.

Some persons then have apparently brought themselves to think, that if in the morning I offer to God all my future acts of the day, I thereby secure beforehand the virtuousness of all those which are not actually evil in object or circumstance. I secure this virtuousness, they think, because by my morning's good intention I secure, that the same good intention shall virtually motive them when they actually occur. But, as Billuart demands (Walsh, n. 668), "if any one, who has in the morning offered his acts to God, be afterwards asked (when he is dining or walking) *for what reason* he dines or walks, who will say that such a man can truly answer, 'I am doing so in virtue of my intention made this morning.'" And the following passage from F. Nepveu, S.J., is so admirably clear on the subject, that we can add nothing of our own to its unanswerable argument :—

When this intention is so far removed from the time of action as happens if one is contented with offering one's actions in the morning, there is reason for fear that this intention will gradually become fainter and even come entirely to an end . . . so that it shall not *inflow at all* into the action. Moreover—since we have a profound depth of self-love—unless we bestow great attention on ourselves and much vigilance on all our [interior] movements, it is difficult to prevent the result, that there escape from us a thousand . . . movements of vanity ; sensuality ; desire to please mankind and curselves ; in fact

a thousand human respects; which are *so many retractations* of our morning intention, and therefore destroy it entirely.—*L'esprit de Christianisme*, pp. 95, 96.

V. In order that some given act be virtuous, theologians commonly require that its virtuousness be directly intended; though such intention of course need be no more than "virtual." Dr. Walsh says (n. 397) that this proposition is maintained by all theologians except a very few (*paucissimos*); and its truth is most manifest on grounds of reason. Take an illustration. I am very desirous (for some special purpose) of conciliating the favour of my rich neighbour A. B. Among other things which I do to please him, I repay him a small sum he had lent me; and I make him a present of some picture, to which he took a fancy when he was paying me a visit. My one motive for both these acts is precisely the same—viz., my desire to be in his good books. Suppose it were said that—whereas the second of these two acts may be indifferent—the first at all events is virtuous under the head of justice, because the repayment of a debt is an act of that virtue: every one would see that such a statement is the climax of absurdity.

On the other hand (as Dr. Walsh proceeds to point out) it is by no means requisite—in order to the virtuousness of an act—that its virtuousness be at the moment the *absolute end* of my action. Suppose I give alms to the deserving poor, in order that I may gain a heavenly reward. Here the virtuousness of almsgiving is directly intended; for it is that very virtuousness, which is my *means* towards my retribution: yet this virtuousness is (by hypothesis) desired only as a means, and not as the absolute end of my action. Most persons will at once admit, that such an act is a truly virtuous act of almsgiving. On the other hand suppose I give alms, merely in order that my outward act may become known and help me to a seat in Parliament—it would be (as we have said) the climax of absurdity to allege that my act of almsgiving is virtuous as such.

There is one class of actions however, which claims further attention. Suppose I do some act entirely for the sake of pleasurable-ness; but, before doing it, I carefully ponder whether the act be a morally lawful one, being resolved otherwise to abstain therefrom. Dr. Walsh (n. 623) refers to this case, and quotes Viva on it; but we do not think that Viva quite does justice to such an act as he supposes. He holds that such an act is neither virtuous nor sinful, but indifferent. We think he would have been much nearer the truth, had he said that it is virtuous. But the true account of the matter (we think) is as follows. In this, as in so many other cases, the will's movement may be decomposed into two simultaneous acts. One of

these acts is; "I would not do what I am doing, were it opposed to morality:" and this is obviously most virtuous. As to the other act—the mere pursuit of pleasurable—under such circumstances, we submit, it is neither virtuous nor sinful, but indifferent.

This will be our appropriate place for considering the *second* tenet, concerning the matutinal oblation of my day's acts, to which we have already referred. According to the *first* tenet on this subject—the tenet which we have already criticized—this obligation secures the result, that my morning intention shall really motive all my subsequent acts of the day, one by one, which are not actually evil in object or circumstances. This is to be sure a most singular notion; but some persons seem to hold another, indefinitely *more* amazing. They seem to hold, that even though the morning intention do *not* in fact motive these acts, nevertheless it makes them intrinsically virtuous. This allegation seems to us so transparently unreasonable, that we feel a real perplexity in divining, how any one even of the most ordinary thoughtfulness can have dreamed of accepting it. We quite understand that God, by His free appointment, may bestow gifts upon a human being, in consideration of what is not virtuous in him at all; as, *e.g.*, in an infant's reception of Baptism, or the Martyrdom of the Holy Innocents. And we understand the doctrine, held (we fancy) by many Protestants, that some act, not intrinsically virtuous, is often extrinsically acceptable to God. But we really do not see how it is less than a contradiction in terms to say, that a given act is made intrinsically virtuous, by a certain circumstance which is no intrinsic part of it whatever. Yesterday afternoon I elicited a certain act; and this afternoon I elicit another, which is precisely similar to yesterday's in every single intrinsic circumstance without exception. Yet the act of yesterday afternoon forsooth was virtuous, whereas the act of this afternoon is otherwise; because yesterday *morning* I made an oblation of my day's acts, and this morning I made no such oblation. You may as well say that my evening cup of tea is sweet, because I put a lump of sugar into the cup which I drank at breakfast. Lugo gives expression to this self-evident principle, by taking the particular case of temperance at meals. You and I are both at dinner; our will is directed (suppose) in precisely the same way to precisely the same ends; and our external acts also are precisely similar. Yet it shall be judged that you are eating virtuously and I otherwise, because *in the morning* you referred your acts to God and I did not. No doubt your morning's oblation may have given you great *assistance* in making your present act intrinsically virtuous, by facilitating your present

reference of that act to a good end. But the act is intrinsically affected by what is intrinsic, not by what is extrinsic. And so Lugo points out; assuming the theological principle, that no act is meritorious which is not intrinsically virtuous. "He who in the morning refers all his acts to God—if afterwards, when he is at dinner, is in just the same state of mind as though he had *not* elicited that matutinal intention, and if his action of eating does not *arise* from that matutinal intention or from some other good and virtuous one—that man no more merits through his present act, than he would if he had never formed such preceding intention if at all." ("De Penitentiâ," d. 7, n. 39.) Sporer states the same proposition very earnestly and emphatically; adding, that such is the common doctrine of theologians. He does not mention indeed so much as one on the opposite side. ("De Actibus," n. 22.)

On this profoundly practical doctrine, we cannot better conclude our remarks than by citing the noble passage from Aguirre, with which Dr. Walsh concludes his volume (nn. 690–692.) It refers however—as our readers will observe—not to a virtuous intention generally, but to that particular virtuous intention which motives an act of *sovereign love*.

Wherefore before all things I admonish—and entreat all theologians to inculcate and preach as a most wholesome doctrine—that each man endeavour, with the whole earnestness and fervour of his mind, to practise continuously and assiduously (so far as this fragile and mortal life permits) the exercise of referring explicitly himself and all his thoughts, affections, words, and works to God, loved for His own sake. For he should not be content if once or [even] at various times in the day he do this; but he ought frequently to insert [explicitly into his daily life] that sacrifice of mind, which is far more acceptable to God than all other homages in the matter of the moral virtues.

VI. Passing now to another matter—how are we to measure the *degree* of virtuousness or sinfulness, in virtuous and sinful acts respectively? It is evident that this consideration must proceed, in the two respective cases, on principles fundamentally different: for in a virtuous act its virtuousness must of necessity be directly intended; whereas in a sinful act its sinfulness cannot by possibility be intended at all as an absolute end. We will take the two classes therefore separately.

As to virtuous acts—it is held (we suppose) by all theologians that, *ceteris paribus*, an act is more virtuous, in proportion as it is directed to virtuousness with greater vigour and efficacy.*

* We find it somewhat hard to find out in what sense theologians use the word "intensio." Do they use it to express "vigour," efficacy"? or do they rather use it to express "effort"? The two ideas are very

We have said "*cæteris paribus*," because one kind of virtuousness may be higher than another. A comparatively remiss act, *e.g.*, of sovereign love (being really such) may be more virtuous than a far more vigorous act of some particular virtue; of justice, or temperance, or beneficence.

As regards the degree of evil in evil acts—we incline to think that theologians have given far too little methodical attention to the subject. For ourselves, we submit that any given act is more morally evil, in proportion as its pursuit of pleasurable-ness is more *inordinate*; more *morally unprincipled*, if we may so speak; in proportion as the act is more widely removed from subjection to God's Will and the Rule of Morals; in proportion as the transgressions of God's Law are more grievous, which such an act would (on occasion) command. In proportion as this is the case, its agent is said to "place his ultimate end in creatures" more unreservedly and more sinfully. However, to set forth in detail—still more to defend—what we have stated, would carry us a great deal too far.*

But, at last it is true, that *all* acts are either virtuous or the reverse? In other words, are there, or are there not, individual acts, which are neither morally good nor bad, but "indifferent"? This is the famous controversy between Thomists and Scotists, which Dr. Walsh (nn. 588-673) treats with quite singular completeness and candour; insomuch that his whole discussion presents (to our mind) one of the most profoundly interesting studies we ever fell in with. He has established (we think) quite triumphantly, that acts may be directed to pleasurable-ness as to their absolute end, without being on that account sinful. We will briefly express our own opinion on the whole matter, by submitting, (1) that very many acts are directed to pleasurable-ness as to their absolute end, yet without any vestige or shadow of

distinct. Consider, *e.g.*, a *blow*, possessing some certain fixed degree of intrinsic force or efficacy; just sufficient (let us say) to overcome a certain definite obstacle. A very strong man will deal forth such a blow without any "effort" or trouble whatever. A weaker man must put forth some exertion for the purpose. A still weaker must exert his whole strength. A child, even if he does exert his whole strength, finds himself unable to accomplish it. In like manner two different acts, elicited by two different persons, may be directed to some given virtuous end with approximately equal "firmness," "tenacity," "vigour," "efficacy;" and yet one may cost the agent quite immeasurably more "effort" than the other. Is it "vigour" "efficacy"—or on the other hand "effort"—which theologians call "intensio"? We incline to think that commonly—yet not quite universally—they use the word in this *latter* sense. But we should be very glad of light on the subject from some competent quarter.

* Something more, however, is said on the subject towards the end of our article.

inordination; and (2) that though such acts are commonly not virtuous, there is no ground whatever for accounting them sinful.*

VII. Here, in order to prevent possible confusion of thought, it will be better to recapitulate four propositions, among those which we have been advocating in the course of our article.

(1) By the very constitution of man's nature, every act of the human will is by absolute necessity, during its whole continuance, intrinsically directed (whether explicitly or virtually) to virtuousness, or to pleasurable, or to some intermixture of the two, as to its absolute end. But it may pursue of course intermediate ends, as "useful" towards those ends which are absolute.

(2) No act is virtuous unless it directly aims at virtuousness as such; and of course therefore it remains virtuous, only so long

* We cannot, however, follow Dr. Walsh in his view (nn. 674-688) of S. Thomas's doctrine on this subject. He considers S. Thomas to teach (see n. 675) that acts may be actually virtuous and referable to God, which are not directed to virtuousness as such. For our own part we altogether agree with F. Murphy of Carlow College—who contributes to the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* of Dec. 16, 1880, a very appreciative review of Dr. Walsh's volume—that the latter writer "has not established his view of S. Thomas's teaching." "In nearly every one of the passages cited," adds F. Murphy, "or in the immediate context, S. Thomas most distinctly mentions *ends* which every Thomist would denominate good." This remark does not indeed apply to *all* the passages cited by Dr. Walsh in n. 683, note, where the Angelic Doctor describes virtue as consisting in a mean. But as regards all these passages, without exception, we submit that S. Thomas is quite manifestly *supposing* throughout a real aim at virtuousness on the agent's part. "I am desiring to pursue the course of virtue; and I inquire therefore (in this or that individual case) what is the true *mean* wherein virtue consists." For ourselves—with very great deference to Dr. Walsh—the only passages which we can consider to need any special attention, are the two from the "*De Malo*," cited in nn. 686, 687. On these passages we would submit the following reply to Dr. Walsh's argument.

F. Mazzella has considered them (along with several others from S. Thomas) in his important volume "*De Virtutibus Infusis*," n. 1350; and he by no means understands them as Dr. Walsh does. According to Dr. Walsh, S. Thomas teaches in them (1) that an act, not directed to virtuousness as such, may nevertheless be free from inordination and referable to God; then (2) that such an act, if elicited by one in habitual grace, is meritorious of supernatural reward. According to F. Mazzella—what S. Thomas teaches is, that an act (otherwise faultless)—which is directed indeed to impersonal virtuousness (*bonum honestum*) as its end, but which is neither explicitly nor virtually referred to God—that such an act (if elicited by one in a state of grace) is meritorious of supernatural reward. Now this latter doctrine may or may not be theologically true; it may or may not be S. Thomas's ordinary doctrine; but at all events it is fundamentally different from that which Dr. Walsh ascribes to the Angelic Doctor, and is entirely unexceptionable so far as regards any ground of natural reason. And we submit that, without travelling one step beyond the two articles to which Dr. Walsh refers,

as that aim continues. But such aim need not be explicit: sufficient if it be virtual.

(3) Acts which are explicitly or virtually directed to pleasurable as to their absolute end, are either "inordinate" or not. If they are, they are sinful; if they are not—and if they are not otherwise faulty in object or circumstances—they are commonly indifferent.*

(4) The morning oblation of my acts to God is a most auspicious and effective commencement of a well-spent day. It is the first link of a potentially continuous chain; and most powerfully tends to effect that those acts be successively directed to virtuousness, when they come to be elicited in due course. But if an act be not *in fact* so directed, all the morning oblations in the world cannot suffice to make it virtuous. Nay, if I offer my acts to God every hour of every day, such oblation could not

we can establish conclusively the correctness of F. Mazzella's interpretation. We turn then to the earlier article of the two: "De Malo," q. 2, a. 5, c. We italicise a few words.

"If we speak of an individual moral act," says S. Thomas, "every particular moral act is of necessity either good or bad, because of some circumstance or other. For it cannot happen that an individual act be done without circumstances, which make it either right or wrong (*rectum vel indirectum*). For if anything be done when it should (*oportet*), and where it should, and as it should, such an act is ordinate and good; but if any one of these fail, the act is inordinate and bad. And this should most of all be considered in the circumstance of the end. For what is done because of *just necessity and pious utility*, is done laudably, and the act is good. But what is destitute of just necessity and pious utility is accounted 'otiose,' . . . and an 'otiose' word—much more an 'otiose' act—is a *sin*" according to Matt. xii. 36.

Nothing then can well be more express than S. Thomas's statement, that every act, not directed to a virtuous end, is "inordinate" and "a sin." We have already said in the text, that we cannot ourselves here follow the Angelic Doctor, because we admit a very large number of indifferent individual acts. But S. Thomas's meaning is surely indisputable. No doubt, later theologians would say, that acts done for the sake of impersonal virtuousness are "innately," "connaturally," "by their own weight," referred to God; whereas S. Thomas speaks of them as not referred to God at all. But F. Mazzella points out (n. 1350) that S. Thomas and many others of the older theologians were not in the habit of using the more modern language on this head. And of course it is nothing *more* than a question of language.

We hope our readers will pardon this digression. The question is a vitally practical one; and it is of much importance clearly to understand what is S. Thomas's doctrine thereon.

* We say "commonly" because we wish to avoid the speculative controversy, whether an act can be virtuous, which is directed indeed to virtuousness as to an intermediate end, but to mere pleasurable as to its absolute end. The exact meaning we give to the word "inordinate," is explained towards the end of our article. And we there also treat of two certain condemned propositions, not unfrequently alleged in controversy against the doctrine which we follow.

infallibly secure that my acts be virtuous during the interval. That my act of eleven o'clock is offered to God, does not infallibly secure that my act of ten minutes past eleven be intrinsically directed to virtuousness; and if it be not so directed, it is not virtuous.

VIII. This will be our most convenient place for exhibiting the well-known distinction between "Liberty of exercise" and "Liberty of specification." I do not at this moment possess Free Will *at all*, if I do not possess at least the power of *acting* or *abstaining* from action as I shall please.* If I have so much power of choice as this and no more, I have at least "Liberty of exercise." But as regards the very great majority of my free acts, I do possess more power than this. I possess the power—not only of either acting or abstaining from action—but of acting in this or that given *direction* as I shall please. We have deferred to this place our notice of the fundamental distinction here set forth, because by far its best illustration will be found in what now follows.

IX. All Catholic theologians and philosophers hold, that the thought of "beatitude" and again of "generic goodness [*bonum in communi*]" imposes on the will necessity of *specification*. Whether on the other hand such thought do or do not impose necessity of *exercise*, this is disputed; and Suarez for one answers in the negative. (See, *e.g.*, "Metaph.," d. 19, s. 5.) But it is very important carefully to examine the true signification of that common dictum, on which all are agreed; because it has at times (we think) been mischievously misunderstood. Firstly then as to beatitude.

Let us suppose that an imaginary state of privilege be proposed to me as possible, in which on the one hand I shall enjoy a very large amount of mental and physical enjoyment: while on the other hand I shall be entirely free from suffering of every kind; in which accordingly there shall be absolutely no pain of ungratified wish, or of remorse, or of self-discontent. But let us further suppose that this state of privilege should involve no exemption from sin; that I should be involved in habits of pride, vain-glory, sensuality, and indeed general indifference to God's will. We are not here meaning for an instant to imply that such a state of privilege is possible, consistently with the constitution of human nature; or again consistently with God's methods of government: but still the supposition contains no contradiction in terms, and may therefore intelligibly be made. Would the thought of such a privilege as this impose on my will

* So in the well-known Catholic definition, "*protest agere et non agere.*"

necessity of specification? God forbid! Manifestly I have abundant proximate power to elicit an act, whereby I shall repudiate and detest such a possible prospect; and I am bound indeed by strict obligation to abstain from all complacency in the thought of it.

On the other hand, let an imaginary state of privilege be proposed to me as possible, in which I shall be exempt, not only from sin, but from all moral imperfection; in which I shall elicit continuous and vigorous acts of theological and other virtues; but in which nevertheless I shall be a victim to severe continuous suffering, both mental and physical. No one will doubt that I have full power (to say the least) of earnestly deprecating such a future.

But now, lastly, let us suppose that an imaginary state of privilege is proposed to me as possible, in which secure provision shall be made both for unmixed virtuousness and unmixed pleasurable-ness; in which there shall neither be moral imperfection, nor yet pain and suffering. Such a state of privilege would be termed by Catholic theologians a state of "beatitude," in the widest range they give to that term. We may call it "generic" beatitude; and it is distinguished from more definite beatitudes, as the genus is distinguished from the species. Thus there is a certain definite beatitude, which God has proposed to mankind in raising them to the supernatural order: this is "supernatural" Beatitude, and its special characteristic is the Beatific Vision. There is another definite beatitude, which God would have proposed to mankind had he left them in the state of pure nature: see Franzelin on "Reason and Faith," c. 3, s. 4. There is again perhaps another, which will be enjoyed by the souls in Limbus. But these, and any further number of more definite beatitudes, are but different cases of that beatitude which we have called "generic." It is plain moreover that all these several beatitudes agree with each other in their *negative* characteristic—viz., that they exclude all moral imperfection and all suffering: whereas they may differ indefinitely on the positive side, as regards the kind or degree of virtuousness and pleasurable-ness which they respectively contain.* But it is on generic beatitude, and not on any of these particular beatitudes, that we are here principally to speak.

* We need hardly remind our readers, that, even within each one of these more definite beatitudes, there is a large inequality of individual endowment. One person in heaven *e.g.* enjoys indefinitely more of supernatural Beatitude than another.

But it is remarkable, as a matter of theological expression, that the soul of Christ—notwithstanding its unspeakable suffering—is always spoken of as having been "Beata" from the very moment of its creation, on account of its possessing the Beatific Vision. And this circumstance

We say, then, in accordance with all Catholic theologians and philosophers, that the thought of generic beatitude imposes on my will necessity of specification. A moment's consideration will show the obvious certainty of this truth. If—when thinking of beatitude—I am not under necessity of specification, I have the power of preferring to it some other object. But what can such object possibly be? By the very constitution of my nature I am physically unable to pursue or desire any absolute end, except only virtuousness and pleasurable-ness; while both virtuousness and pleasurable-ness are included in beatitude, without any admixture whatever of their contraries. There is much then in the thought of that privilege to attract me, and absolutely nothing to repel me. It may be objected indeed, that the thought of *virtuousness* is *repulsive* to many persons, because they have learned to associate it with the thought of irksomeness. But those who are thus minded, are not really contemplating beatitude at all: they are not contemplating a state, from which all irksomeness is as stringently excluded as all sin.

A similar objection indeed may be put in a much stronger shape, but answered at once on the same identical principle. It may be said that the thought of Supernatural Beatitude itself is very far from imposing on men's will necessity of specification. There are many excellent Catholics, who entirely take for granted indeed that the Beatitude of heaven is one of unspeakable delight; and who yet, as regards their own *conception* of that Beatitude, would vastly prefer some happiness more nearly resembling their earthly enjoyments. Nay it may perhaps even be said that, excepting eternal punishment itself, few imaginable prospects of a future life would be more formidable to them, than the promised heaven as invested with that shape in which their imagination depicts it: so intimately does their imagination associate the thought of continually gazing on God, with the notion of something dreary, weary, monotonous. Such men are most assuredly under no necessity of specification, in the desire (as they exhibit it) of future beatitude. But then this is only because their *picture* of that beatitude fundamentally differs from its original; because their intellect and imagination fail adequately to realize, how peremptorily the Beatific Vision will exclude the most distant approximation to dreariness, weariness, monotony. This case therefore presents no difficulty

indeed furnishes another instance of the fact on which we are especially insisting—viz., that the theological term "beatitude" is very far indeed from synonymous with the English word "happiness" as commonly used. The sense ordinarily given by theologians to the term "beatitude" is—we submit with much confidence—substantially identical with that exhibited in our text.

whatever, even on the surface, in the way of our accepting the theological statement, that the thought of true beatitude—supernatural or natural—imposes on my will necessity of specification. A more plausible objection however to that statement is the following.

Beatitude—so the objector may urge—is presented to my mind in a certain concrete shape; and I may easily enough desire *greater* virtuousness or *greater* pleasurable-ness, than happens to be included in that presentation. To this objection, however, also the reply is not far to seek. (1) I do not the less desire beatitude in the very shape in which it is presented to my intellect, because I *also* desire something more. And (2) that “something more” is not something *different* from beatitude; but beatitude itself in higher kind or greater degree. We need hardly add, that those who shall be in the actual enjoyment of beatitude, will necessarily be preserved from all emotions of discontent or repining.

Suarez, however, and some other theologians, add that the thought of beatitude does *not* impose on my will necessity of *exercise*. When that thought presents itself, I am free to abstain (they think) from deliberately eliciting any correspondent act of will whatever. But we need not enter on this controversy, which is of most insignificant importance.

So much on “beatitude;” and very little more need be added on the similar term “generic goodness.” Goodness—in the sense here relevant—is simply “that which is able to attract the human will;” “that which can be made an end of human action or desire.” Goodness therefore (as has already been explained) is exhaustively divided into (1) “virtuousness;” (2) “pleasurable-ness;” (3) “utility” towards either of the two former ends. But this fact—though otherwise of great importance—is entirely beside the present question, and need not here be taken into account. Our argument is simply this. If it were true that the thought of generic goodness does not impose on my will necessity of specification, this statement would precisely mean, that I have the power to pursue or desire some other end, in preference to pursuing or desiring goodness. But this supposition is a direct contradiction in terms; because “goodness,” by its very definition, includes every end which man is *able* to pursue or desire. The thought then of “generic goodness” may or may not impose on my acts necessity of exercise; but most certainly does impose on them necessity of specification.

X. We are thus led to consider a common theological statement, than which hardly any other perhaps in the whole science needs more careful examination and discrimination. Words are often used by the greatest theologians, which seem on the surface

to mean (1) that the thought of "felicity" imposes on the will of all men necessity of specification; nay (2) further, that whatever else they desire, they desire only as a *means* to felicity; (3) lastly (and most amazingly of all) that this is a truth quite obvious on the surface of human nature. Now if such language as this be understood in the sense it may well present to an ordinary reader, we should say for our own part that such a doctrine, concerning man's desire of felicity, might with far greater plausibility be called self-evidently *false* than self-evidently true. Is it self-evidently impossible then, that even in the smallest matter I can prefer virtuousness to happiness, if I suppose the two to clash? Is it self-evidently impossible that I can obey God because of His just claims on me, without thinking of my own felicity at all? Is it self-evidently impossible, that I can act justly to others, except as a means to my own enjoyment? Is every sinner under the impression that sin is his best road to happiness? Or, in other words, is every sinner necessarily an implicit heretic? But we need not pursue the picture into further details. We may be very certain that this is not what can have been meant by theologians. Our purpose here is to explain what they *intend* by language which admits of such gross misapprehension.*

Firstly then we would point out, that the word "felicity" is always used in theology as synonymous with "beatitude;" and that thus its sense is importantly different from that of the English word "happiness," as commonly used. This latter word (as we have already incidentally pointed out) commonly expresses "my sum of *enjoyment*," quite distinctly from the question of virtuousness or sin. But S. Thomas, *e.g.*, defines "beatitude" as "perfect and sufficing good" (1^a 2^{ae} q. 5, a. 3, c.): would he describe happiness, irrespective of virtuousness, as "perfect and sufficing good"? In the very next article indeed he expressly answers this question; for he says that "felicity" on earth (so far as it can be attained) "*principally* consists in virtuous action [in actu virtutis]." Other theologians speak similarly. Arriaga, *e.g.*, divides "felicity" into "moral" and "physical:" the former signifying virtuousness, and the latter enjoyment ("De Beatitudine Naturali," n. 27). Theologians then do not say that man's motive of action is always desire of his own *happiness*. At the utmost they say no more, than that it is always desire of his own *beatitude*—*i.e.*, desire of a certain complex blessing—which includes the virtuous no less than the pleasurable.

* On what seems to us the true doctrine concerning men's desire of happiness—and again on their obligation of pursuing that happiness—we would refer to Dr. Ward's "Philosophical Introduction," pp. 402-423.

These remarks, however, of themselves by no means meet the full difficulty of the case. For a very large number of the greatest theologians say, not only that the thought of beatitude imposes on my will necessity of specification, but also that my desire of beatitude is the one primary source of all my actions. Yet—objectors will ask on hearing such a statement—can this be maintained? Is it really true that all human acts are motivated by desire of beatitude? The impure man indulges in forbidden pleasure; the envious or malevolent man rejoices in his neighbour's suffering; the irreligious man detests God's Law, as imposing on him an intolerable yoke. Is it really true that these three men first form to themselves a picture of beatitude in any sense of that term; and that their respective sins are motivated by their desire of such beatitude? Or even in the case of a good man, is it really true that every act of grateful loyalty to his Redeemer, of obedience to his Creator, of zeal for the salvation of souls, is preceded (either explicitly or implicitly) by a mental picture of his own beatitude? To all these questions we reply, that no such inferences are necessarily involved in the theological dictum, that "men do everything for the sake of beatitude." A large number of the greatest theologians interpret the dictum as simply meaning this: "Every one of my acts," they say, "is directed to the attainment of some good or other, be it virtuous or pleasurable. But the sum of all such good constitutes beatitude: therefore every one of my acts is interpretatively referred to beatitude, because it is actually referred to a solid portion thereof."*

We conclude, that there is no one absolute end whatever of all human action; but on the contrary that as many absolute ends are possible, as there are possible exhibitions whether of the virtuous or the pleasurable. No doubt God is *by right* my one exclusive Ultimate End; or, in other words, I act more perfectly, in proportion as I come nearer to a state in which all my acts are ultimately referred to Him, whether explicitly, virtually, or connaturally. (On the last adverb see our preceding n. III.) But, as a matter of *fact*, it need hardly be said that the number of human actions is enormously great, which are motivated quite otherwise.

XI. We now arrive at the last of our necessary preliminaries. Those acts on which our argument will principally turn, are those which are "perfectly voluntary." Here, therefore, we must explain what we mean by "perfectly voluntary." Two conditions are necessary, in order that an act may have that attribute. The

* Dr. Ward, in his "Philosophical Introduction" (pp. 410-415), quotes passages to this effect from Suarez, Vasquez, Viva: but he might have added indefinitely to the number of his authors.

will must be in a certain given state; and the act itself must possess certain given characteristics. We will consider successively these two conditions.

Firstly then, the will must be in a certain given state. It must be "*sui compos*;" or (as we may translate the expression) "self-masterful." This condition is so familiar to the experience of all, that a certain general description of it will amply suffice. We may say then that my will at this moment is "self-masterful," if I possess the proximate power of regulating my conduct by steady and unimpassioned resolve. This condition is, of course, unfulfilled, if I am asleep; or intoxicated; or in a swoon; or otherwise insensible. Or (2) so violent a storm of emotion may be sweeping over my soul, that I have no proximate power to prevent this emotion from peremptorily determining my conduct. Or (3) I may be in what may be called a state of invincible reverie; I may be so absorbed in some train of reflection, that nothing can disturb my insensibility to external objects, except some (as it were) external explosion. During such periods, my will entirely fails of being "self-masterful." At other periods again, it may fail of being *entirely* "self-masterful." I may be *half* asleep; or *half* intoxicated; or my emotions or my reverie may leave me no more than a most partial and imperfect power, of proximately regulating my conduct by steady and unimpassioned resolve. All this is so clear, that we need add nothing further thereon.

But it is of great importance to our direct theme, that we set forth systematically how fundamental is the distinction in idea, between my will being "self-masterful," and being "free." Nothing is more easily conceivable, than that at the moment I have on one hand full proximate power of regulating my conduct by steady and unimpassioned resolve; while yet on the other hand that this resolve (should I form it) be inevitably determined for me, by what a Determinist would call "the relative strength of motives." In fact, Determinists hold just as strongly as Libertarians, the broad and momentous distinction of idea which exists, between the will being "free" on one hand, and on the other hand no more than "self-masterful."

Here then is the first condition necessary, in order that my act be "perfectly voluntary:" my will must at the moment be entirely "self-masterful." On the other hand, when we say that some given act is "perfectly voluntary," we mean that it is (1) "explicit;" and (2) (what we will here call) "mature."*

* We do not forget that some theologians use the phrase "perfectly voluntary" as synonymous with "free." But we think our own sense of the term is much the commoner, and also much more appropriate and convenient.

Let us consider these two elements successively. The latter is very easily explained; but the former will need our careful attention.

In order to make clear what is meant by "explicit" acts—and again by "explicit" thoughts—our best plan will be to pursue a course somewhat resembling that (see our preceding n. IV.) whereby Dr. Walsh explains what is meant by "virtual." If we ask any given man what he is doing at any given moment, he will pretty certainly be ready with an answer. "I am conning my brief for to-morrow's sitting," says the lawyer. "I am trying a new kind of steam-plough," says the farmer. "I am pursuing the fox," says the sportsman. "I am standing in expectance of buyers," says the shopman. "I am watching this furnace," says the stoker. "I am attending to my opponent's speech, that I may answer it," says the M.P. "I am driving down to my man of business," says the country gentleman. And so on indefinitely. In all these cases, of course, there may be other acts of will or intellect simultaneously proceeding; but the prompt answer given to our question shows (to use a very intelligible expression) what is *on the surface* of each man's mind. Now an "explicit" act means precisely an act "which is on the surface of my mind."

For the sake of illustration, let us pursue the last instance which we gave. I am driving down to my man of business. This may most properly be called an "act," because it began with an order I gave to my coachman, which I can revoke at any moment. As I proceed, I look dreamily from my carriage window at the various objects which present themselves; these objects summon up an indefinite number of associations, in regard both to the present and the past; silent processes of thought ensue, and an ever-varying current of emotion; acts of repentance; of yearning; of complacency; of grief; of anxiety; follow each other in rapid succession. Still no one of these so rises to the *surface* of my thoughts, that it would furnish my spontaneous answer to a friend who should ask me what is my present employment. By careful mental analysis I may observe a very large number of the thoughts, emotions, volitions, which are peopling my mind; but still none of these thoughts, emotions, volitions, furnish spontaneously my reply to the proposed question. They are mental phenomena, of which I am truly "conscious" indeed; but which, nevertheless, are "implicit" phenomena.

On the other hand my mental procedure may be quite different from this. As I drive along, I concentrate my energies on the examination of some scientific problem; on pressing various data to their legitimate conclusion; on harmonizing the various

truths which I have already acquired. Under these circumstances, if I were asked what is my present employment, I should spontaneously answer that I am occupied in this scientific investigation. This scientific investigation then is my "explicit" act; and my carriage drive has sunk into the position of "implicitness." Or it may be again, that *both* acts are on the surface of my mind and explicit; so that my spontaneous answer to the question—"what is my present employment?"—would enumerate both of the two. And what we have said on this particular instance, is applicable to ten thousand other cases, in which one or two "explicit" acts may be accompanied by an indefinite number of "implicit" thoughts or acts simultaneously proceeding.

But it is not only that the explicit act is often *accompanied* by implicit acts or thoughts: one important *element* of the explicit act itself—we refer to its end or motive—is much more commonly implicit. Go back to our barrister studying his brief. What is the animating motive which impels him to this labour? Perhaps he is merely prompted by that virtuousness or pleasureableness or union of the two, which he recognizes in the due performance of his routine duties. Perhaps he is stimulated by prospects of ambition; by the thought of rising to fame and eminence. Perhaps he is aiming at the due permanent support of wife and children. Perhaps again these various ends are simultaneously (in whatever proportion) inflowing into his work. Lastly, if he is a devout and interior Christian, the thought of God's approval may probably enough supply his absolute end of action; though various intermediate links *conduce* to this absolute end. But whatever be the absolute end which he is effectively and continuously pursuing, only at rare intervals will it become explicit. For the most part the study of his brief so exclusively occupies the surface of his mind, that no other thought can share that prerogative. Nay, his end of action may even *vary* from time to time, without his being aware of the fact; though of course he *might* become aware of it by sufficiently careful introspection.

So much then for explicit acts; but one further explanation must most carefully be borne in mind. Explicit acts need not be "reflected on." Explicit acts (as we have explained) are acts which are on the surface of my mind; but they need not be direct objects of my explicit thought. What the barrister explicitly contemplates, is his brief with its contents: he does not in general explicitly contemplate his *study* of that brief. Let us briefly elucidate this important distinction.

The great majority of my thoughts (whether explicit or implicit) have for their object somewhat external to my mind. I am contemplating my chance of success at the bar; or the

probable price of money in the immediate future; or Mr. Gladstone's Irish land bill; or the beauty of this poetry, or music, or scenery; or the mysteries of God and Christ. But if I am psychologically disposed, a certain small number of my thoughts will have for their object my own mental phenomena. These thoughts may be called "reflexive," because in eliciting them I "turn back" my attention on myself.* Acts of the will then, which are the *object* of these reflexive thoughts, may be called acts "reflected on." They are not only "explicit," but something more; they are actually at the moment *reflected on* by me as such.

We must here introduce two explanations of terminology. Firstly, Catholic theologians often speak of "full advertence to an act," or "to the substance of an act." As we understand the matter, they precisely mean by this, that the act is what we have called "explicit." Most certainly they do not necessarily mean, that the act is "reflected on;" and that there is a reflexive thought in my mind which has such act for its object.

What we have said concerning "full advertence to an act," or "the substance of an act," applies of course equally to virtuous and sinful acts. It must be carefully distinguished from that "full advertence" to the "malitia" of a sinful act, which so many theologians (rightly or wrongly) maintain to be required for commission of mortal sin. On the latter we shall speak before we conclude.

Our second terminological explanation refers to the word "consciousness." Sometimes this word is used, as though I were not "conscious" of any except "explicit" acts; nay, sometimes as though I were not "conscious" of any acts, except those "reflected on." We think that a different usage from this is far more appropriate and convenient. We shall say that *every* act, elicited by my soul, is one of which I am "conscious." We may obviously divide this term—consistently with our previous remarks—into consciousness "implicit," "explicit," and "reflected on." But we are disposed to think that no one, or hardly any one, *consistently* uses the word "consciousness" in a sense different from ours. When by introspection I have come to observe the existence in my mind of some given implicit act or thought—we think almost every one will say that I detect simultaneously, not only the act or thought itself, but also my (hitherto latent) "consciousness" of that act or thought.

So much on the "explicitness" of acts. But (as we have said) in order that they be "perfectly voluntary," it is further neces-

* They are called by Catholic writers, "*actus reflexi*;" but, curiously enough, the term "reflex acts" is commonly used by contemporary philosophers in a sense quite extremely opposite.

sary that they be "mature." When any thought whatever of the virtuous or the pleasurable is proposed to me by my intellect, my will in the first instant is attracted to the end so proposed, without itself having (if we may so speak) any voice in the matter. Even after the first instant, a further period elapses, before my will has had opportunity to put forth its *full* power in the way of acceptance or repudiation. It is not then until this *second* period has come to an end, that the act becomes (what we have called) "mature." It is when an "explicit" act has become "mature," that theologians call it "perfectly deliberate." For our own part (as we have already said) we think it better to avoid the word "deliberate" as much as possible; because we are disposed to think that the particular question, which is our direct theme in this article, has been indefinitely obscured by an equivocal use of that term.

No act, therefore, is "perfectly voluntary," unless my will at the moment possess full self-mastery; nor unless the act itself be (1) explicit and (2) mature. If an act (1) is "implicit," or (2) merely "inchoate"—it belongs to a different category.

We have now sufficiently prepared our way for treating our direct theme, the extent of Free Will. Concerning our own doctrine—at this early stage of our argument we need say no more than this. According to our view of the matter—whereas throughout the day I am almost continuously engaged in one perfectly voluntary act or other—all these acts are not voluntary only, but also perfectly free. They possess this liberty, not only at starting, but uninterruptedly during their whole course; inasmuch that I am my own master, and responsible for my course of action, during pretty nearly the whole of my waking life. We do not mean indeed that my action at any given moment is always either formally virtuous or formally sinful; because (as we have already explained) we recognize the existence of many acts which, even materially, are indifferent. But we do say that (speaking generally) there is not any absence of *liberty*, which would prevent such acts from being formally virtuous or sinful during their whole continuance. This is the doctrine, which in due course we are to illustrate and defend. But we must first dispose of that most divergent tenet, to which we have so often referred, and which it is the direct purpose of our article to assail.

There is a large number then of firmly convinced Libertarians—especially in the non-Catholic world—who are earnestly opposed to our doctrine; and who consider that a man's possession of Free Will is a more or less exceptional fact in his daily life. They hold that I do not possess Free Will, except at those particular

moments, in which I have expressly consulted and debated with myself between two or more competing alternatives, and have just made a choice accordingly. "Shall I resist this evil thought," I have just asked myself, "or shall I not resist it?" "Shall I adopt this course of life, which promises better for my spiritual interests and worse for my secular;—or shall I adopt that other, which promises better for my secular interests and worse for my spiritual?" I have just made my choice between these two alternatives, and in making it I was free. But when this express self-debate and self-consultation have come to an end, then (according to these philosophers) my Freedom of Will has also for the time ceased.

This theory has always impressed us as most extraordinary; and we have been in the habit of thinking, that it has largely originated in an equivocal sense of the word "deliberate." Men constantly say, and with undoubted truth, that no act can be perfectly free, unless it be "perfectly deliberate"—*i.e.*, unless it be "explicit" and "mature." But the *verb* "to deliberate" is often used as synonymous with to "debate and consult with one's self;" and this sense—though fundamentally different from the former—is not so entirely heterogeneous from it, as to prevent the possibility of confusion. A "deliberate act" comes almost unconsciously to be taken as meaning, "an act which has been deliberated on;" and thus a notion has grown up, that no other kind of act is really free. But whatever may be the origin of the tenet which we criticize, we do not deny that its advocates may adduce one argument at least in their own favour, which is not entirely destitute of superficial plausibility. I cannot be free at this moment in eliciting any given act—so far all Libertarians are agreed—unless I have the proximate power at this moment, either to do it, or to abstain from doing it, as I may please. But—so the argument may proceed—I have not this proximate power, unless I have been just now expressly *consulting* with myself between these two alternatives. We shall not fail in the sequel to give this reasoning due attention.

Such however being our opponents' argument—they are obviously led to a further conclusion, from which indeed (we believe) they by no means shrink. Even at the period of my internal debate and self-consultation, I have been no otherwise free, than as regards the particular alternatives which have competed for my acceptance. Let us suppose, *e.g.*, that I have long since firmly resolved to pursue a systematically inimical course, against some one who has offended me. At this moment I debate with myself—not at all whether I shall desist from my injurious machinations—but only whether I shall adopt this particular *method* of aggression or some other. Our opponents

would hold, that my resolve of assailing him is not at the moment a free resolve at all; because on *that* question I have been holding with myself no express consultation whatever. I am only free just now—they consider—in my election of the *particular* mine which I shall spring against him. This is a most obvious result of their theory; nor are we aware that they at all disavow it.

As we are throughout primarily addressing Catholics, we will begin by briefly considering this tenet in its theological aspect. And firstly let us consider its bearings on our Blessed Lady's Free Will. Theologians point out in detail, how continuous throughout each day were her merits, while she remained on earth; and how unspeakably elevated a position she has thereby attained in heaven. Now if her merits were continuous, her exercise of Free Will must have been continuous also. Yet how often did she debate and consult with herself, on the choice which she should make between two or more competing alternatives? Never, we suppose, except in those comparatively most rare instances, when she did not certainly know what course at some given moment God preferred her to take. All the acts, *e.g.*, wherein, faithful to grace, she avoided imperfection—were destitute of liberty, and destitute therefore of merit. For no Catholic will of course dare to say, that she ever debated and consulted with herself, whether she should or should not elicit some given action, known by her as the less perfect alternative.

But the theological objection is even immeasurably graver, in the case of Jesus Christ. It is simply impossible that even once, while upon earth, He should have debated and consulted with Himself between two or more competing alternatives. This supposition, we say, is simply impossible: because at every moment He knew, in the Beatific Vision, what act His Father desired at His hands; and most assuredly did not debate or consult with Himself, whether or not He should elicit that act accordingly. Consider in particular His freely-accomplished death for the salvation of mankind. Did He debate and consult with Himself, whether He should die? But if He did not, then (according to our opponents) He was not *free* in dying; and man's redemption remains unaccomplished. We do not indeed at all forget how many difficulties the theologian encounters, in harmonizing the various truths connected with our Lord's Free Will in dying. But any one, who has studied the discussions on this question, will thus only receive a stronger conviction than he could well obtain in any other way, how absolutely unheard of and undreamed of among theologians is that theory on the supposed limits of Free Will, which it is our direct purpose to attack.

And we are thus led to express theological citations on the subject. We will select a very few out of the large number adducible; but they shall be amply sufficient to show beyond the possibility of doubt, how profoundly at variance is this theory with the voice of standard Catholic theologians.

There is no more authoritative writer just now on Moral Theology, than F. Gury; and his treatise has of course received great additional importance, since F. Ballerini has chosen it for his text-book. Now in the seventeenth edition of Gury's work, on which Ballerini founded his own of 1861, occurs the following singularly express statement. "Although," says Gury, "the Free and the Voluntary are mutually distinguishable in the abstract [in se distinguantur], in man during his earthly course [in homine viatore] they are in reality not distinguished: because man, during his earthly course, while *sui compos*, *never acts under necessity*." According to this statement, then, all human acts are free, except, *e.g.*, when the agent is asleep, or otherwise incapable of truly voluntary action. And F. Ballerini made on this no adverse comment whatever.

In his edition of 1875 we find F. Gury's words slightly modified. They now run thus—

Although the Free and the Voluntary are distinguished in the abstract—as is plain from the Definition of the two—nevertheless in those acts in which man on this earth tends to his end, they are in fact never separated: for whenever any act is voluntary, it is free; and vice-versâ. The reason is, because (as S. Thomas says) in those acts which are directed to [man's] ultimate end, nothing is found so bad as to contain no admixture of good; and nothing so good as to suffice in all respects [for satisfaction of desire]. Now the only thing which the will has not the power to abstain from willing, is that which has the unmixed quality of good [completam boni rationem habet]: such is perfect beatitude, or [man's] ultimate end; for the sake of which all [other] things are desired.

Here, it will be seen, F. Gury is making a distinction, which he had not made in his earlier editions, between those acts on one hand which men perform as *conducive* to their ultimate end, and those acts on the other hand in which they aim immediately at that ultimate end itself. It will be further seen, that, as regards these latter acts, Gury regards them as subject to necessity of exercise, no less than to necessity of specification. But as regards that vast number of perfectly voluntary actions, which are directed immediately to some other end than that of my own beatitude—Gury pronounces that they are certainly free. Yet the enormous majority of such actions during the day are indubitably elicited, without express self-debate and self-consultation.

Ballerini, in his edition of 1878, cites at length the passage of S. Thomas to which Gury refers; and then adds this remark: "Which doctrine—accordant as it is no less with Right Reason than with the Catholic Faith—shows plainly in what light a certain recent philosophy is to be regarded, which (under the title of "The Limits of Human Liberty") introduces without any ground [*inaniter invehit*] innumerable acts, in which [forsooth] man on earth (being otherwise *sui compos*) is supposed to be necessitated." What the "modern philosophy" is, here so severely censured by F. Ballerini,—we confess ourselves entirely ignorant; but we should say from his context, that it must be some Catholic philosophy. Ballerini himself at all events is plainly full of suspicion, as to any philosophy which would circumscribe "human liberty" by undue "limits."

Let us now pass to standard theologians of an earlier period; or rather to Suarez, who (as will be immediately seen) may stand as representing them all. Suarez then holds ("De Oratione," l. 2, c. 20, n. 5) that those acts of love, which holy men elicit in a state of ecstasy, are free: sometimes with liberty of specification, always with liberty of exercise. No one will say that holy men in a state of ecstasy expressly debate and consult with themselves, whether they shall continue their acts of love or no. And presently (n. 8) Suarez adds: "It is the common axiom of theologians that, externally to the Beatific Vision, the will is not necessitated in exercise by force of any object which is but abstractively known, however perfectly"—i.e., which is not known in the Beatific Vision. According to Suarez, then, it is the common axiom of theologians that no object necessitates the human will, except only God as seen face to face in heaven. It might indeed be a matter of reasonable inquiry how far so simply universal a statement—concerning the whole body of theologians—is consistent with the fact, that many theologians consider the will to be even under necessity of exercise, when the thought of beatitude is proposed in this life. There is no reason however for us to undertake such inquiry. We need nothing for our own purpose, except to show how unheard of among theologians is the particular notion which we are directly combating; and this fact is most abundantly evident from our citations.

We should add that Suarez ("De Bonitate et Malitiâ Actionum Humanarum," d. 5, s. 3, nn. 22-35; "De Gratiâ," l. 12, c. 21) makes plain how admitted a truth it is with theologians, that an act protracts its virtuousness or sinfulness—in other words, preserves its freedom—during the whole of its continuance.*

* The discussions in Moral Theology concerning the "number" of sins, sometimes (we incline to fancy) produce a certain misapprehension.

From the ground of theological authority, we now proceed to the ground of reason. And, in arguing with our present opponents, we are to take for granted the truth of those doctrines, and the validity of those arguments, which they hold and adduce in common with ourselves. Now in our articles against Determinism, we laid very great stress on that ineradicable conviction of their own Free Will, which is common to all mankind; a conviction which is the more remarkable, because so very few can look at their own habitual conduct with satisfaction, if they choose carefully to measure it even by their own standard of right. All Libertarians agree with us on this matter; and lay stress on the fact to which we refer, as furnishing (even though it stood alone) a conclusive proof of Free Will. They say—no less than we say—that on such a subject the common sense and common voice of mankind are an authority, against which there lies no appeal. In arguing then against *them*, we have a right to assume the principle to which they themselves assent; we have a right to assume the peremptory authority due, on this subject, to the common judgment of mankind. We now therefore proceed to maintain that—when our opponent's theory is embodied in concrete fact and translated into every-day practice—the very doctrine of Determinism is less repulsive to the common sense and common voice of mankind, than is *their* doctrine on the limits of Free Will. We will explain what we mean, by a short succession of instances.

We will begin with one, to which we just now referred in a different connection. Let us suppose that I have long resolved on a course of grave enmity against some one who has offended me; and that I have long with entire consistency acted on that resolve. It has become indeed an inveterate habit with me—a first principle (as it were) of conduct—so to act; and as to raising the question with myself, whether I shall or shall not

It is sometimes perhaps unconsciously supposed, that if—during some given period—A's sins are more numerous than B's of the same kind, A may presumably be considered to have sinned more grievously than B during the same period. But the very opposite inference is quite as commonly the true one. A perhaps interrupts his sinful action from time to time, and again renews it; while B continues his evil course uninterruptedly and unrelentingly. We need hardly point out, that in such a case (gravity of the sinful action being equal) B formally commits far more of mortal sin than A, precisely *because* A's sins are more "numerous." The number of instants, during which A merits increased eternal punishment, is much smaller than the number of instants during which B does so. Yet B's sinful instants make up what in the Confessional is only counted as one sin; while A's—from the very fact of their having been interrupted—count as many. On the other hand, we do not forget that (as Suarez somewhere observes) the fresh starting of a mortally sinful act involves a certain special malitia of its own.

continue in the same groove,—I should as soon raise the question with myself, whether I shall or shall not continue to support my children whom I tenderly love. At this moment, however, I am debating and consulting between two different *methods* of assailing my foe which suggest themselves; and I am calculating which of the two will inflict on him the heavier blow. Under these circumstances our opponents must say, that I am free indeed in my choice between these two evil machinations; but that I am strictly *necessitated* to carry out my original resolve of injuring him in what way I can. I am strictly necessitated at this moment so to act—if our opponent's theory be accepted—because at this moment I have been as far as possible from consulting and debating with myself on this particular question. But if I am necessitated so to act, I cannot of course incur any formal sin thereby. In other words, I no more commit formal sin at this moment by pursuing his ruin to the bitter end, than I commit formal sin by giving my daughter a new bonnet in proof of my affection.

Those Catholics, who are more or less implicated in the theory which we are opposing, sometimes seek to evade the force of our objection by a singular reply. They reply, that (under the supposed circumstances) though my earnest resolve of crushing my enemy be not *directly* free, yet it is free “in causâ; in its cause.” They argue therefore, that they can consistently call my present resolve formally sinful, because they consider that resolve to be “*free in its cause.*” But what is meant by this recognized theological expression? There is no doubt whatever about its meaning. My resolve—they must mean to say—was “directly” free at its outset, because then I did debate and consult with myself whether I should or should not form it. Moreover at that time of outset, I was well aware that, if I formed such a resolve, the issue would in all probability be a long continuance of my revengeful action. Consequently (they urge) I *then* incurred the formal guilt of my subsequent evil machinations. Well, the whole of this is entirely true; but then it is no less entirely irrelevant. Indeed their making such an answer, is but an unconscious attempt to throw dust into the eyes of their critic. For we are not now discussing with our opponents the moral quality of that evil action—now so long past—which I elicited in forming my detestable resolve. We are discussing with them the moral quality of my *present* evil volition; wherein I apply myself to the vigorously *carrying out* that earlier resolve, without any pause of self-debate and self-consultation. And their theory must compel them to admit, that this volition is destitute of liberty, and exempt therefore from sin. According to their tenet (we say) I am as exempt from formal sin in

continuing my settled plan of revenge, as though I were engaged in hymning the divine praises, or in spiritually assisting a sinner on his death-bed.

As an opposite picture—before we proceed to the case of saintly Catholics, let us take a more ordinary specimen of human virtue. Let us look, *e.g.*, at such a person as the excellent Elizabeth Fry; and such a work as her reformation of the Newgate female prisoners. “The pleasures, which London affords to the wealthy, were at the disposal of her leisure. But a casual visit paid to Newgate in 1813 revealed to her the squalor and misery of the wretched inmates. She succeeded in forming a society of ladies, who undertook to visit the female prisoners. The most hardened and depraved evinced gratitude; and those who had hitherto been unmanageable, became docile under her gentle treatment.”* One cannot suppose that she entered on this noble enterprise without much planning, self-debate, self-consultation: and in the *planning* it, our opponents will say that she was free. But when her heart and soul became absorbed in her glorious work—when she no more dreamed of debating with herself whether she should discontinue it, than of debating with herself whether she should include dancing lessons in her course of instruction—then, forsooth, her Free Will collapsed. Thenceforth there was no more formal virtue in her noble labours, than if instead thereof she had spent her husband’s money in equipages and dress, and had enjoyed in full “the pleasures which London offers to the wealthy.”

In truth—on this amazing theory—there can be no such thing as confirmed laudableness or confirmed reprehensibleness of conduct. When my habit of virtue or of sin is confirmed, I no longer, of course, commonly *debate* or *consult* with myself whether I shall act in accordance with its promptings; and, not being free therefore on such occasions, I cannot by possibility act either laudably or reprehensibly.

Then consider the devout and interior Catholic who labours day by day and hour by hour that his successive acts be virtually and energetically referred to God. He may spare himself the pains (if our opponents’ theory hold) as far as regards any supposed laudableness which can thence accrue. If indeed he were weak-kneed and half-hearted in his spiritual life—if he were frequently *debating* and *consulting* with himself whether he should trouble himself at all with referring his acts to God—then he might no doubt from time to time elicit acts formally virtuous. But it is far otherwise with a fervent Catholic.

* Slightly abridged from Walpole’s “History of England,” vol. i. p. 202.
VOL. VI.—NO. I. [Third Series.] F

Again and again he is too much immersed in the thought of God to think reflexively about *himself*. He dwells on the mysteries of Christ; he makes corresponding acts of faith, hope, and love; he prays for the Church; he prays for his enemies; he prays for the various pious ends which he has at heart; and his thoughts are entirely filled with such holy contemplations. Who will be absurd enough to say that this holy man has all this time been expressly *debating* with himself whether he shall or shall not cease from his prayers and meditations? Yet, except so long as such debate continues, he possesses, forsooth, no liberty; and his prayers are no more formally good and meritorious, than if he were in bed and asleep.

Surely such a view of things as we have been exhibiting is one which would inexpressibly shock any reasonable man who should contemplate it in detail. And yet we cannot for the life of us see how the consequences, which we have named, fail to follow in their entirety from that theory on the limits of Free Will, which we so earnestly oppose. Now, on a question so profoundly mixed up with every man's most intimate experience, it is not too much to say that the universal testimony of mankind is a conclusive proof of truth. Moreover (as we have already pointed out), the adverse testimony of mankind is a consideration which inflicts a blow of quite singular force on those particular thinkers with whom we are just now in controversy. They press the adverse testimony of mankind, as conclusive against Determinists; and we in our turn press it, as even more conclusive against themselves.

Such is the first reply which we adduce against our opponents. Our second is the following:—The main argument—it will be remembered—by which we purported to establish Free Will was based on man's experienced power of putting forth anti-impulsive effort. We here assume that our present opponents agree with us on the validity of our reasoning on this head: because, of course, it was in our earlier papers, and not in this, that the proper opportunity occurred for vindicating the efficacy of our earlier argument. So much then as this we may consider to be common ground between our present opponents and ourselves—viz., that whenever I put forth "anti-impulsive effort,"—in that moment at all events I possess Free Will. Let us proceed then to point out how very frequently it happens that I am putting forth (perhaps very successfully) these anti-impulsive efforts, on occasions when I do not dream of *debating* and *consulting* with myself whether I shall put them forth. I have received, *e.g.*, some stinging insult; I have offered it to God; I have firmly resolved (by His grace) steadfastly to resist all revengeful emotions thence arising. I make this resolve once

for all : and I no more dream of *debating* with myself whether I shall continue to act on it, than of debating with myself whether I shall in due course eat my dinner. Yet how frequent—at first perhaps almost unintermitting—are my anti-impulsive efforts. Again and again—while I am engaged in my daily occupations—the thought of the insult I have received sweeps over my soul like a storm, awakening vivid emotions in correspondence. As every such successive emotion arises, I exert myself vigorously to oppose its prompting. But the most superficial glance will show that such exertion is, very far oftener than not, put forth spontaneously, unhesitatingly, eagerly ; without any admixture whatever of self-debate and self-consultation. Nay, it is precisely in proportion as this may be the case—in proportion as the element of self-debate and self-consultation is more conspicuously absent—in such very proportion that particular argument for my possessing Free Will becomes more obviously irresistible, which is based on the promptitude and vigour of my anti-impulsive effort.

Thirdly, another consideration must not be omitted, which does not, indeed, rise in the way of argument above the sphere of probability, but which (within that sphere) is surely of extreme weight. There is no question on which the infidels of this day profess themselves more profoundly agnostic, than this : What is the meaning, the drift, the significance of man's life on earth ? Is life worth living ? And if so, on what grounds ? Theistic Libertarians most justly claim it as an especial merit of their creed, that it supplies so intelligible and effective an answer to this question. This life (they say) is predominantly assigned by God to man, as a place of probation ; such that on his conduct here, depend results of unspeakable importance hereafter. Yet, according to those particular Libertarians with whom we are now in controversy, man's probation is at last confined to certain rare and exceptional passages of his earthly existence. Even of that normal period, during which his will is most thoroughly self-masterful, active, energetic, supreme over emotion—during which he devises and carries out his chief schemes, develops his most fertile resources, manifests and moulds his own most distinguishing specialties of character—very far the larger portion is entirely *external* to this work of probation, which one would expect to find so pervasive and absorbing. During far the greater portion of this period (we say) our opponents are required by their theory to account him destitute of Free Will ; unworthy therefore of either praise or blame ; incapacitated for either success or failure in his course of probation.

It is quite impossible that a theory, so paradoxical and

startling, could have found advocates among men undeniably able and thoughtful, had there not been at least some one superficially plausible argument adducible in its favour. We have already said that there is one such argument; and we have no more imperative duty in our present article than fairly to exhibit and confront it. We will suppose an opponent then to plead thus—

"I am not free at this moment, unless I have the proximate power at this moment, either to do what I do or to abstain from doing it. But I cannot have this proximate power of choice, unless I have what may be called a 'proximate warning;' nor can I have this, unless I have expressly in my mind the two alternatives between which I am to choose. I promised my daughter that, the next time I went to the neighbouring town, I would bring her back some stamped note-paper. Well, here I am, close to the stationer's shop; but I have clean forgotten all about my promise. No one will say that, under these circumstances, I have proximate power of choice as to getting the note-paper. Why not? Because I have received no *proximate warning*. Let the remembrance of my promise flash across my mind, this affords the condition required. In like manner, if I am expressly debating and consulting with myself at this moment whether I shall do this act or abstain from it—here is my proximate warning. But if I am not thus expressly debating and consulting, then I have no proximate warning at all, nor proximate power of choice."

Now, in replying to this, we will confine our discussion to perfectly voluntary acts. Our contention, as a whole, is, that all perfectly voluntary acts are perfectly free; and that all imperfectly voluntary acts have a certain imperfect freedom of their own. But assuredly no one who is convinced of the former doctrine will stumble at the latter; and we need not trouble ourselves therefore with specially arguing in its favour. Then, for our own part, we follow Suarez in thinking that even as regards men's desire of beatitude—however accurately they may apprehend that blessing—they possess therein full liberty of *exercise*.* And accordingly we hold (as just set forth) that all perfectly voluntary acts in this life, without exception, are perfectly free. This then being understood, the sum of the answer we should give to the argument above drawn out, is this: and we submit our view with profound deference to the judgment of Catholic theologians and philosophers. I possess an *intrinsic continuous sense* of my own Free Will: and this sense amply

* This particular question seems to us so devoid of practical importance that there is no necessity of giving reasons for our opinion.

suffices to give me the proximate warning required for proximate power of choice. Now therefore to exhibit this statement in greater detail, and to defend it by argument.

It is commonly said by Libertarians, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, that man's Free Will is a simple and unmistakable fact of experience. Arriaga, *e.g.*, considers it to be so immediate an object of perception, that you can as it were touch it with your hand (*quasi manu palpare*). And indeed a very common expression is, that men are "conscious" of their own Free Will. Mr. Stuart Mill objected to this use of language. "We are *conscious*," he said, "of what *is*, not of what *will* or *can* be." In April, 1874 (pp. 351-2), we admitted, that on the verbal question, we are disposed here to agree with Mr. Mill;* though he had himself in a former work (by his own confession) used the word "consciousness" in the very sense to which he here objected. He had used the word, as expressing "the whole of our familiar and intimate knowledge concerning ourselves." However, we willingly accepted Mr. Mill's second thoughts, in repudiation of his first thoughts; and we have throughout abstained from using the word "consciousness" in the sense to which he objected. "We will ourselves," we added, "use the word 'self-intimacy' to express what is here spoken of." We will not then say that I am "conscious" of my own Free Will, but that I have a "self-intimate continuous sense thereof." So much on the question of words; and now for the substance of what we would say.

How is this self-intimate continuous sense engendered, of the power which I have over my own actions? Let us first consider, by way of illustration, another self-intimate continuous sense of power, which I also indubitably possess: my sense of my power over my own limbs. When I was first born, I was not aware of this power; but my unintermittent exercise thereof has gradually given me a self-intimate continuous sense of my possessing it. A student—let us suppose—has been sitting for three hours on the edge of a cliff at his favourite watering-place, immersed in mathematics. A little girl passes not far from him, and falls over the cliff, to the great damage of her clothes, and some damage of her person. Her mother reproaches the mathematician for not having prevented the accident; though probably enough he may have quite a sufficient defence at his command. But suppose what he does say were precisely this: "I could not reach your child without *moving*;" "and in the hurry of the moment, I really did not remember

* We have spoken on the meaning of this word "conscious" in a previous page.

"that I had the *power* of moving. I must tell you that it was "full three hours since I last had moved my legs; and you "cannot be surprised therefore that my remembrance of my "possessing the *power* to move them was none of the freshest." The mother would feel that he was here adding insult to injury. Had she scientific words at her command, she would energetically press on him the fact, that his sense of his power over his limbs is not a fitful, intermittent sense, liable to temporary suspension; but on the contrary is such a continuous self-intimate sense, as would have most amply sufficed had he possessed any genuine inclination to move.

Now as to the still more important power which I possess—the power of resisting my will's spontaneous impulse—my experience of it (no doubt) did not begin for (say) a year or two after I had habitually experienced my power over my limbs. But when once it did begin, it was called into almost as frequent exercise. If I received a good moral and religious education—that very statement means, that I was repeatedly summoned to the exercise of anti-impulsive effort, in the interests of religion and morality. If I received *no* such education—the circumstances of each moment nevertheless brought with them after their own fashion a lesson, entirely similar as regards our present argument. My life would have been simply intolerable, had I not a thousand times a day energetically resisted my will's spontaneous impulse, in order to avert future suffering and discomfort, or in order to avoid the displeasure of those among whom I lived. This proposition we assume, from our previous articles on the subject. In accordance then with the well-known laws of human nature, I acquired by degrees (as I grew up) a self-intimate continuous sense, that I have the *power* of resisting at pleasure my spontaneous impulse; or (in other words) that my Will is Free. My notion of acting *at all* with perfect voluntariness has become indissolubly associated with my notion of acting *freely*. I have a self-intimate continuous sense that I am no slave to circumstances, whether external or internal; that I have true control over my own conduct; that I am responsible for my own voluntary acts. The very consciousness that I am acting *voluntarily*, carries with it the sense that I am acting *freely*. This self-intimate sense suffices to give me proximate warning at each instant of perfectly voluntary action; and so suffices to give me a true proximate power of choice—whatever I may be about at the moment—between continuing to do it and abstaining therefrom.

Before going further, let us examine what we have now said by the test of plain facts; and let us once more resort to our old illustration of the revengeful man. I am firmly resolved to

inflict on my enemy whatever suffering I can; for such indeed is my rooted and inveterate principle of conduct: but I am debating with myself what *method* of aggression will just now be most conducive to my end. Now we say this. If I believe in Free Will at all, and if I choose to think about the matter at all, I cannot possibly persuade myself that the doctrine of "limited" Free Will here holds good. I cannot possibly persuade myself that I am free indeed at this moment in my choice between these *particular* machinations; but that my *general* resolve of crushing him is a *necessitated* act, for which I incur no present responsibility. We really do not think that any one, capable of self-introspection, would here even dream of any statement contrary to ours, except under extremest pressure of a paradoxical theory. But if I cannot possibly persuade myself that my resolve is necessitated—this is merely to say, in other words, that I invincibly recognize within myself the proximate power of choosing at this moment to abandon such resolve.

In truth the cases are by no means rare, in which it is most obvious on the surface—in which no one can by possibility doubt—that I have most abundant proximate power of choice, without any debate or self-consultation. The whole psychology of *habit* (as we have already implied) is here directly to our purpose. I have acquired a deeply-rooted habit of forgiveness, and receive a stinging insult. Spontaneously and instinctively—as soon as my will obtains even a very moderate degree of self-mastery—I select between the two alternatives, of succumbing or not succumbing to my violent emotion. I select the virtuous alternative; I fight successfully God's battle in my soul; I should be utterly ashamed of myself if I condescended to self-debate and self-consultation. It is precisely because I do *not* so condescend, that I have *more* proximate power (not less) of making my effective choice between the two alternatives.

It may be said, no doubt, that this sense of proximate power given me by an acquired habit is not *continuous*; for it is only at comparatively rare intervals that any one given acquired habit has occasion of exhibiting its efficacy. Still other instances are easily found in which my self-intimate power does continue intermittently. Consider, *e.g.*, my self-intimate sense of the power which I possess, to talk correct English, or to practise correct spelling. Consider a groom's self intimate continuous sense, that he possesses the power of riding; or a law-clerk's, that he possesses the power of writing legibly. Again, a very conspicuous instance of what we mean is afforded by the phenomena of gentlemanliness. One who has lived all his life in thoroughly gentlemanly society, has a continuous self-intimate sense of his power to comport himself like a gentleman throughout every event of the day. Or let

us adduce a very different illustration. Suppose I am suffering under some affection in the neck, which makes this or that posture intensely painful. At first it does not happen so very unfrequently, that I accidentally assume the posture and incur the penalty. But as time advances, I obtain by constant practice the desired knack, of so moving myself as to avoid pain; and the possession of that power is speedily followed, by my self-intimate continuous sense of its possession.

The sum then of what we have been saying is this. On one hand the self-intimate continuous sense of possessing this or that proximate power, is by no means an uncommon fact in human nature. On the other hand it is established by due introspection—and easily explicable also by recognized psychological laws—that men do possess this self-intimate continuous sense of their proximate power, either to acquiesce in their spontaneous impulse of the moment, or to resist it. In other words, they possess a self-intimate continuous sense of Free Will; a sense which at every moment gives them proximate warning of their responsibility.

Such—we are convinced—is substantially true doctrine, concerning the extent of Free Will; and we only wish we had space to enter on its more complete and detailed exposition. One theological objection however occurs to us, as possessing a certain superficial plausibility; an objection, founded on that very doctrine which we alleged against our opponents—viz., the doctrine of our Blessed Lady's interior life. If men's self-intimate sense of liberty is founded on their repeatedly experienced power of resisting spontaneous impulse—how (it may be asked) can *she* have acquired it, who was never even once called on or permitted to resist spontaneous impulse? But the answer is obvious enough. Those most noteworthy characteristics, which so conspicuously distinguished her interior life from that of ordinary mortals, did not arise (we need hardly say) from the fact that her nature differed from theirs; but from a cause quite different. They arose from the fact that—over and above that perfection of natural and supernatural endowments with which she started—God wrought within her a series of quite exceptional Providential operations: operations, which preserved her infallibly from sin; from concupiscence; from moral imperfection; from interruption of her holy acts and affections. If this continuous sense of Free Will therefore were required for the formal virtuousness of her acts, it is included in the very idea of God's dealings with her, that He either directly infused this sense into her soul, or otherwise secured for her its possession. And if it be further inquired how her possession of Free Will was consistent with the fact, that her uninterruptedly virtuous action was infallibly secured—nothing on this head need be added to the most lucid explanation

given by Suarez and other theologians. For our own purpose however we should further explain, that though she possessed Free Will—as did our blessed Lord—we do not for a moment mean to imply that she was in a state of *probation*. And we should also add, once for all, that what remarks we have farther to make in this article will not be intended as including our Blessed Lady within their scope, but only as applying to other human persons.

We have now completed all which strictly belongs to our direct theme; and must once more express that we put forth all our remarks with diffidence and deference, submitting them to the judgment of Catholic theologians and philosophers. But we would further solicit the indulgence of our readers, while we touch (as briefly as we can) two further subjects, which are in somewhat close connection with our theme; which throw much light on it; and which are in some sense necessary as its complement. No one can more regret than we do, the unwieldy length which thus accrues to our article. But the course of our series will not bring us again into contact with the two subjects to which we refer; and if we do not enter on them now, we shall have no other opportunity of doing so. We cannot attempt indeed to do them any kind of justice; or to set forth in detail the arguments which seem to us adducible for our doctrine concerning them. Still we are very desirous of at least stating the said doctrine; in hope that other more competent persons may correct and complete whatever is here mistaken or defective.

The first of these two subjects concerns the relation between Free Will and Morality. And at starting let us explain the sense of our term, when we say that, during certain periods, a man has a “prevalent remembrance” of this or that truth. A merchant, *e.g.*, is busily occupied at this moment on ‘Change. There are certain general principles and maxims of mercantile conduct, which he has practically learned by long experience, of which he preserves a “prevalent remembrance” throughout his period of professional engagement. This does not mean that he is actually *thinking* of them all the time; but that he has acquired a certain quality of mind, in virtue of which (during his mercantile transactions) these various principles and maxims are proximately ready, to step (as it were) into his mind on every approximate occasion. Or to take a very different instance. A fox-hunter, while actually in the field, preserves a “prevalent remembrance” of certain practical rules and sporting axioms—on the practicability, *e.g.*, of such or such a fence—which again and again saves him from coming to grief. Now this “prevalent remembrance” may, in some cases—instead of being confined to particular periods

—become “pervasive” of a man’s whole waking life. Let us take two instances of this, similar to two which we have already given in a somewhat different connection. The thoroughly gentlemanly man enjoys all day long a “pervasive remembrance” of the general laws and principles which appertain to good breeding. And one who for many years has had a malady in his neck possesses all day long a “pervasive remembrance” of what are those particular postures which would give him pain. This does not mean, either that the gentlemanly man or again the neck-affected man never for one moment forgets himself; but it does mean, that the instants of such forgetfulness are comparatively very few.

This terminology being understood, we submit the following proposition:—As all men on one hand, throughout all their long periods of perfectly voluntary action, possess a self-intimate sense of their Free Will; so on the other hand, during the same periods, they preserve a “pervasive remembrance” of two cardinal truths. These two truths are (1) that virtuousness has a paramount claim on their allegiance; and (2) that pleasurable-ness (whether positive or negative) will incessantly lead them captive, whenever they do not actively resist it. We have already said, that we have no space here for anything like a due exhibition of the arguments adducible in support of our statement; and as regards, indeed, the *second* of our two cardinal truths, we suppose every one will be disposed readily enough to accept it. As regards the *former* of our truths—that virtuousness has a paramount claim on men’s allegiance—we have of course nothing to do here with proving that it *is* a truth. This task we consider ourselves to have abundantly performed on more than one earlier occasion; and we would refer especially to our article on “Ethics in its bearing on Theism,” of January, 1880. Again, we are not for a moment forgetting, that men differ most widely from each other (on the surface at least) as to what are those particular acts and habits which *deserve the name* of “virtuous.” Still, we have maintained confidently, on those earlier occasions, that the idea “virtuousness,” as found in the minds of all, is one and the same simple idea; and that virtuousness, so understood, is really recognized by all men, as having a paramount claim on their allegiance. What we are *here* specially urging is, that (throughout their period of perfectly voluntary action) all men—even the most abandoned—preserve a “pervasive remembrance” of this truth.

We have already explained how entirely impossible it is on the present occasion to attempt any adequate exhibition of the arguments adducible for our doctrine; but such considerations as the following are those on which we should rely:—Firstly, let it be

observed how indefinitely large is the number of moral judgments which succeed each other in every one's mind throughout the day. "I am bound to do what I am paid for doing." "K. behaved far better than L. under those circumstances." "M. is really an unmitigated scoundrel." "No praise can be too great for N.'s noble sacrifice." "How base it was of O. to tell me those lies." "What cruel injustice I received at the hands of P." It is not merely men that live by moral rule and look carefully after their consciences who are quite continually thus speaking; but the general rough mass of mankind. Even habitual knaves and cheats are no less given than honest people to censure the conduct of others as being unjust, oppressive, mendacious, or otherwise immoral. "There is" moral "honour" and moral dishonour "among thieves." The notion of right and wrong, in one shape or other, is never long absent from any one's thoughts; even his explicit thoughts. Then, secondly, let those psychical facts be considered, which have led ethical philosophers of the intuitionist school to insist on "the still small voice of conscience;" the instinctive efforts of evil men to stifle that voice; the futility of such efforts, &c. &c.* We are entirely confident that such statements are most amply borne out by experienced psychical facts; though we cannot here enter on the investigation.

If the doctrine be accepted which we have here put forth, assuredly it throws most important light on man's moral constitution. My self-intimate sense of Free Will—we have already seen—gives me unintermittent information of my responsibility for my acts one by one. But now further the Moral Voice, which I can so constantly hear within me—in emphatic correspondence with that information—gives me full proximate warning, by what *standard* I am to measure those acts. On the one hand, I am *free* to choose; while on the other hand I *ought* to choose virtuously. The claims of virtuousness—the attractions of pleasurable—these are (as one may say) the two poles between which my moral conduct vibrates. Either motive of action is legitimate within its sphere, but one of the two rightfully claims supremacy over the other. And my self-intimate sense of Free Will unfalteringly reminds me that I am here and now justly reprehensible and worthy of punishment, so far as I rebel against the higher claim, under solicitation of the lower attractiveness.

* So (as one instance out of a thousand) F. Kleutgen speaks: "Conscience," he says, "does not *always* so speak and raise its voice, as to take from man the power of turning from it and *refusing to listen*." "It is often in man's power to abstain from entering into himself and *lending his ear* to that voice," &c. &c. We quoted the whole of F. Kleutgen's very remarkable passage, in October, 1874, pp. 44-450.

The second subject on which we desire to touch, is a certain thesis concerning the kind and degree of advertence required for mortal sin. That tenet concerning the extent of Free Will, which it has been our direct purpose to oppose, is very seldom (if indeed ever) applied by Catholics to their appraisal of *virtuous* actions. One never hears, *e.g.*, that a holy man's prayer is necessitated, and therefore destitute of merit, because he has not been just debating and consulting with himself whether he shall or shall not continue it. But there are two classes of occasion (we think) on which the tenet of limited Free Will does at times (consciously or unconsciously) find issue. One of these is when the Catholic defends Free Will against Determinists; under which circumstances he is sometimes tempted by the exigencies of controversy to minimize his doctrine: and on this matter we have now sufficiently spoken. The other occasion is, when question is raised concerning the advertence required for mortal sin. Here then alone would be ample reason for our wishing not to be entirely silent on this grave theological question. But (by a curious coincidence) there is another reason, altogether distinct, which makes it pertinent that we enter on this particular subject. For the thesis to which we have referred, if consistently carried out, would place in a quite extraordinarily and preposterously favourable light the moral position of those infidels, who are our immediate opponents throughout our present series of articles.

Some Catholics then seem to hold, that no mortal sin can be formally committed, unless (1) the agent explicitly advert to the circumstance, that there is at least grave doubt whether the act to which he is solicited be not mortally sinful; and unless (2)—after having so adverted—he resolve by a perfectly voluntary choice on doing it.* Now we admit most heartily, that here is contained an admirable practical rule, as regards a large class of persons whom Moral Theology is especially required to consider. Take a Catholic who is ordinarily and normally averse to mortal sin, and who regularly frequents the Confessional. Such a man may be certain that some given past act, which tends to give him scruple, was not formally a mortal sin unless (at the time of doing it) he explicitly adverted to the circumstance, that there was grave doubt at least whether the act were not mortally sinful. But the thesis of which we are speaking seems sometimes laid down—not as supplying a test practically available in certain normal cases—

* Such seems the obvious sense of Gury's exposition: "De Peccatis," n. 150. S. Alphonsus and Scavini use far more guarded language. Suarez gives a most thoughtful treatment of the matter: "De Voluntario," d. 4, s. 3. But we have no space for citing the dicta of theologians.

but as expressing a necessary and universal truth. If this be the thesis really intended—our readers will readily understand our meaning, when we said just now that it seems intimately connected with that tenet of limited Free Will, which we have been so earnestly opposing. In the first place there is on the surface a very strong family likeness between the two theories. Then, further, we are really not aware of any reasoning by which the “explicit advertence” theory can be defended, unless its advocates assume the tenet of unlimited Free Will. But however this may be—we would entreat theologians duly to consider some few of the consequences which would result, if the “explicit advertence” thesis were accepted. We will begin with the case of those Antitheistic infidels, who are at this time so increasing in number and aggressiveness.

The Antitheist then would not be accounted capable of mortal sin at all. What Catholics call “sin,” is something most definite and special. “Sin”—in the Catholic’s view—is separated by an absolutely immeasurable gulf from all other evils whatever; insomuch that all other evils put together do not approach to that gravity, which exists in even one venial sin. But the whole body of Antitheists (we never heard of one exception) entirely deny that there can be any such “malitia” as this, in any possible or conceivable act. It is simply impossible then—as regards any act in the whole world which the Antitheist may choose to commit—that he shall (before committing it) have asked himself whether it were mortally sinful. And consequently—according to the thesis we are criticizing—it is simply impossible that any act in the whole world, which he may choose to commit, can be formally a mortal sin.

Consequently no such thing is possible to any human being, as gravely culpable ignorance of God. Ignorance of God (according to Catholic doctrine) cannot be gravely culpable, unless it result from the formal commission of mortal sin; and Antitheists (according to this thesis) are *unable* formally to commit mortal sin. Now we are very far from wishing here to imply any special doctrine, concerning invincible ignorance of God: few theological tasks (we think) are just now more urgent than a profound treatment of this whole question. But that there is not, and cannot possibly be, any ignorance of God which is *not* invincible—this our readers will confess to be a startling proposition. We submit, however, that it follows inevitably from the thesis before us.

From Antitheists let us proceed to Theistic non-Catholics. Suarez quotes with entire assent S. Augustine’s view, that the two causes which, immeasurably more than any other, keep back a non-Catholic from discerning the Church’s claims, are (1)

pride and (2) worldliness.* Yet in regard to these two classes of sins—which (in the judgment of S. Augustine and of Suarez) spread so subtle a poison through man's moral nature, and so signally dim man's spiritual discernment—how can the thesis which we are opposing account them mortally sinful at all? What proud man ever *reflected* on his pride? What worldly man on his worldliness? Suppose, *e.g.*, a man considered himself to reflect on the fact that he is eliciting a mortally sinful act of pride: all men would be at once sure that it is his very *humility* which deceives him. He who is at this moment committing what is materially a mortal sin of pride, most certainly does not dream that he is so doing; and still less does he explicitly advert to the circumstance. Or consider some other of the odious characters to be found in the non-Catholic world. Take, *e.g.*, this typical revolutionary demagogue. He is filled with spite and envy, towards those more highly placed than himself. He consoles himself for this anguish, by inhaling complacently the senseless adulation of his dupes. He gives no thought to their real interest—though he may persuade himself that the fact is otherwise—but uses them as instruments for his own profit and aggrandizement. How often does this villain *reflect* on his villainy from one year's end to another? God in His mercy may visit him with illness or affliction: but otherwise the thought never occurs to him, that he is specially sinful at all. Yet would you dare to deny, that during a large part of his earthly existence he is formally committing mortal sin? And remarks entirely similar may be made on the whole catalogue of those specially odious offences, which are built on fanaticism and self-deception.

And now, lastly, we would solicit theologians to consider, how such a thesis as we are considering will apply even to those Catholics who absent themselves from the Confessional and are confirmed sinners. Look at our old case of the revengeful man. My resolve of injuring my enemy in every way I can has become, by indulgence, a part (one may say) of my nature; and I am at this moment immersed in some scheme for inflicting on him further calamity. I have been profoundly habituated, these several years past, to set the Church's lessons at defiance, and to commit mortal sin without stint or scruple. In consequence of

* "Heresy is found in a man after two different fashions—viz., either as himself author of the heresy, or as persuaded by another. And it does not arise after the former fashion, except either from pride or from too great affection for earthly and sensible objects: as Augustine says. But he who is drawn by another into heresy, either imitates [the heresiarch himself] in pride and worldliness; or else is deceived ignorantly and through a certain simplicity."—*De Amissione Innocentiae*, c. 2, s. 17.

this, I no more explicitly advert to the fact that I am sinning mortally in my revengeful resolves — than I explicitly advert to the fact that I am passing through certain streets, on my daily trodden road from my office to my home. Now there is no Catholic, we suppose, who will not admit, that I continue to be formally committing a large number of mortal sins, during all this protracted course of vindictiveness. But how can such an admission be reconciled with the thesis which we are opposing?

Now take an importantly different instance. I am just beginning an habitually wicked life. I secretly retain some large sum, which I know to be some one else's property; or I enter into permanent immoral relations with another person. I cannot get the fact out of my head, and so I am always reflecting on my sinfulness; while I still cannot make up my mind to amend. I formally therefore commit mortal sin, at pretty well every moment of my waking life. Time however goes on; and in due course I become so obdurate, that I do not reflect for a moment, from week's end to week's end, on the circumstance that I am setting God's Law at defiance. Let us briefly contrast these two periods. Suppose, *e.g.*, I make my definitive resolution of remaining in sin, on March 12, 1871; and since that day have not once made any real effort to reform. Then compare the moral life which I led on March 13, 1871, with that which I led on March 13, 1881. On the earlier day I was, beyond the possibility of doubt, formally committing mortal sin almost every moment of the day, during which I was not asleep or tipsy; because I was constantly reflecting on my wicked life, and purposing to continue it. Now my acts of March 13, 1881, taken one by one, are assuredly far more wicked than those of March 13, 1871. Suarez ("De Peccatis," d. 2, s. 1, n. 3) lays down as the commonly admitted doctrine, that "the deformity of mortal sin consists in this—that through such sin the sinner virtually and interpretatively loves the creature more than he loves God." But if, in my acts of March 13, 1871, I was virtually and interpretatively loving the creature more than I loved God—who will doubt that, in those of March 13, 1881, I am doing this same thing very far more signally and unreservedly? And if the former acts therefore were mortally sinful, much more are these latter. Yet, according to the adverse thesis, these latter acts are not mortally sinful at all; because my detestable obduracy is now so confirmed, that I do not even once explicitly advert to the circumstance, how wicked is my course of life.

Such are a few instances which we would press on the attention of theologians, as exhibiting results which ensue from the thesis we deprecate; and many similar ones are readily adducible. We submit with much deference, that a satisfactory solution of the

whole difficulty cannot be found, unless that doctrine be borne in mind which we just now set forth, concerning (1) men's self-intimate sense of Free Will; and (2) the constant urgency of the Moral Voice speaking within them. But before entering directly on this argument, we will distinctly express two propositions; which otherwise it might possibly be supposed that we do not duly recognize. First—there cannot possibly be mortal sin in any act, which is not “perfectly voluntary;” and we have fully set forth in our preceding n. xi. how much is contained in this term “perfectly voluntary.” Secondly — no one can commit mortal sin, except at those times in which he possesses full proximate power of suspecting the fact. When we come indeed to treat the particular case of Antitheistic infidels, we shall have to guard against a possible misconception of this statement; but to the statement itself we shall entirely adhere. So much then having been explained, we will next try to set forth, as clearly as is consistent with due brevity, the principles which (as we submit) are truly applicable to the moral appreciation of such instances as we have just enumerated.

We begin with the revengeful Catholic, who is well aware indeed of the circumstance that his vindictive machinations are mortally sinful: but who is so obdurate in his sin, that he gives no explicit advertence to their sinful character. If those doctrines which we advocate are admitted—concerning his self-intimate sense of Free Will, and the constant monitions of his Moral Voice—he has evidently, during almost the whole period occupied by these revengeful machinations, full proximate power of explicitly adverting to their sinfulness. There may be occasional moments of invincible distraction; and at those moments (we admit) his formal commission of mortal sin temporarily ceases; but these surely cannot be more than exceptional, and recurring at rare intervals. And such as we have here given, would be substantially (we suppose) the account given by all Catholic thinkers; for all Catholics surely will admit, that his successive machinations are for the most part (even if there be any exceptional moment) imputed to the agent as mortally sinful.

We now come to the second instance. A Catholic (we have supposed) has plunged into some mortally sinful mode of life; at first he has been tormented all day long by remorse of conscience; but in due course of obduration, has entirely ceased to reflect on his deplorable state. Now in order to solve both this and the other difficult cases which we just now set forth, it is necessary (we think) not only to bear in mind the doctrines which we have already exhibited concerning men's self-intimate sense of Free Will and the monitions of their Moral Voice—but another

doctrine also entirely distinct. We may call this the doctrine of "inordination." It is one on which recent theologians (we venture to submit) have not sufficiently insisted;* but which is of most critical importance on such questions as we are now discussing. It has been expressed and illustrated with admirable force by the late F. Dalgairns, in that chapter of his work on "The Blessed Sacrament," which is called "Communion of the Worldly;" a chapter which we earnestly hope our readers will study as a whole in the present connection. We can here only find room for a very few of the relevant passages.

Christianity holds as a first principle, that God is to be loved above all things; in such a sense that if a creature appreciatively loves any created thing more than God, he commits a mortal sin (second edition, p. 359).

When the affection for an earthly object or pursuit for a long time together so engrosses the soul, as to superinduce an habitual neglect of God and a continued omission of necessary duties, then it is very difficult for the soul to be unconscious of its violation of the First Commandment, or (if it is unconscious) not to be answerable to God for the hardness of heart which prevents its actual advertence (*ib.*).

We will suppose a merchant entirely engrossed in the acquisition of riches. No one will say that to amass wealth is in any way sinful. It has never come before him to do anything dishonest in order to increase his property, and he has never formed an intention to do so. Nevertheless, if his heart is so fixed on gain, that his affection for it is greater than his love of God—even though he has formed explicitly no design of acting dishonestly—he falls at once out of the state of grace. Let him but elicit from his will an act by which he virtually appreciates riches more than God, that act of preferring a creature to God (if accompanied by sufficient advertence) is enough of itself to constitute mortal sin. . . . The First Commandment is as binding as the Seventh; and a man who does not love God above all things, is as guilty as the actual swindler or thief (*ib.* p. 360).

And in p. 317 F. Dalgairns adduces theological authority for his doctrine. We should be disposed to express it thus. Any one (we should say) is at this moment materially committing mortal sin, if he is eliciting—towards this or that pleasurable end—some act of the will so inordinate, that by force of such act, he would on occasion violate a grave precept of God, rather than abandon such pleasure. And he formally commits mortal sin,

* All theologians admit that no divine precept can possibly be violated, except through the sinner's inordinate attachment to creatures. But we venture to think that the tendency has of late been to dwell too exclusively on the violation of precept; and not to exhibit in due prominence the attachment to creatures. S. Thomas's treatment of such matters is emphatically different (we think) in its general tone.

if he elicits such an act while he possesses full proximate power to suspect its being mortally sinful.

Or let us exhibit our doctrine in the concrete. No one (as has been so repeatedly pressed in this article) can possibly offend God, except for the sake of this or that pleasure; and every one therefore who commits mortal sin, is *ipso facto* preferring some pleasure to God. At this moment I am gravely calumniating an acquaintance, in order to gratify my vain-glory by being more highly thought of than he is. Here are two concomitant mortal sins; related to each other, as respectively the "commanding" and "commanded" act ["actus imperans:" "actus imperatus"]. The "commanding" act is my mortal sin of vain-glory; the "commanded" act is my mortal sin of calumny. But how comes the former to be a mortal sin? There is no sin whatever in my mere desire of being highly thought of by my fellow-men. True; but that desire is "gravely inordinate"—"a mortal sin of vain-glory"—if it be such, as to command what is objectively a mortal sin, rather than lose the pleasure at which it aims.* But now observe. I may, the next minute, altogether forget the particular man whom I have been calumniating; and the "commanded" mortal sin may thus come to an end. But this is no reason in the world why my "commanding" mortal sin—my sin of vain-glory—should change its character. If it were mortal sin before—and if there be no change in its intrinsic qualities—it continues to be mortal sin now. Wherein does its mortally sinful character consist? In this: that *by force* of my present act, I should on occasion gravely offend God, rather than lose the pleasure at which I am aiming;

* "If love of riches so increase that they may be preferred to charity;—in such sense that, for the love of riches, a man fear not to act in opposition to the love of God and his neighbour;—in this case avarice will be a mortal sin. But if the inordination of the man's love [for riches] stop within this limit; in such sense that, although he loves riches too much, nevertheless he do not prefer the love of them to the love of God, so that he do not will for their sake, to do anything against God and his neighbour—such avarice is a venial sin." S. THOMAS, 2^a 2^{ae} q. cxviii. a. 4.

"Inordination of fear is sometimes a mortal sin, sometimes a venial. For if any one is so disposed that—on account of that fear whereby he shrinks from danger of death or from some other temporal evil—he would do something prohibited or omit something commanded in the Divine Law—such fear will be a mortal sin."—*Ib.* q. cxxv. a. 3.

"If the inordination of concupiscence in gluttony imply aversion from a man's Ultimate End, "accipiat secundum aversionem à Fine Ultimo," so gluttony will be a mortal sin. Which happens, when a man cleaves to the pleasurable of gluttony as to an end, on account of which he despises God: being prepared to violate the Precepts of God, in order to obtain such gratifications."—*Ib.* q. cxlviii. a. 2.

F. Ballerini says (on Gury, vol. i. n. 178) that S. Thomas's "Secunda Secundæ" "ought never to be out of the Confessor's hands."

or (in other words) that, by eliciting my present act of vain-glory, I appreciatively prefer to God the being highly thought of by my fellow-men.

Here then we are able to explain what we mean, by "inordinate" desire of pleasurable. The particular given act—wherein I desire the pleasure which ensues from good opinion of my fellow-men—may be of three different characters, which it is extremely important mutually to distinguish. It may (1) be such, that—by force of such act—I would rather gravely offend God, than lose the pleasure in question: in which case the act is "gravely inordinate," and (at least materially) a mortal sin. Or it may be (2) such that—by force of such act—I would rather offend God *venially* (though not gravely) rather than lose the pleasure: in which case the act is "venially inordinate" and "venially sinful." Or, lastly—however strong my act of desire may be—yet it may not be such that, by force of it I would offend God *in any way* rather than lose the pleasure. In this latter case, the act is not "inordinate" at all; not properly called "vain-glory" at all; nor (as we should say) possessing any element whatever of sin.*

It will be remembered also, that that "gravely inordinate" act, which is materially a mortal sin, is not one formally, unless the agent possesses full proximate power of suspecting this fact.

* In the early part of our article we referred with entire assent to Dr. Walsh's argument in favour of the doctrine here assumed, that an act may be directed to pleasurable as to its absolute end, yet without inordination. But there are two condemned propositions, often cited against this doctrine, which we ought expressly to notice. They are the 8th and 9th condemned by Innocent XI. (Denz, nn. 1025, 6): "Comedere et bibere." &c, "Opus conjugii," &c." On the former of these, we need do no more than refer to Dr. Walsh's remarks from n. 638 to n. 641; with which we unreservedly concur. On the latter, what we would say is substantially what Viva says: The constitution of lapsed human nature being what it is—there is one most definitely marked out class of pleasurable ends, which tend to exercise so special and abnormal influence over a man's will, that his pursuit of them will quite infallibly be "inordinate" (in our sense of that term) unless it be kept in check by being subordinated to some virtuous end. Now it is obvious that those who (like ourselves) affirm this, may utterly repudiate the proposition condemned by Innocent XI.; and yet entirely hold that general doctrine concerning indifferent acts, which we have exhibited in our text. It may be well to add, that F. Ballerini (on Gury, vol. ii. n. 908) has some valuable remarks concerning the virtuous ends which may be pursued in that particular class of acts to which we refer.

Another theological remark. The distinction which we have made, between the "inordinate" and "non-inordinate" pursuit of a pleasurable end, is closely connected (if indeed it be not identical) with the recognized theological distinction, between pleasure being sought as the "*finis positivè ultimus*" and "*negativè ultimus*" respectively. (See Dr. Walsh, n. 479; and Ballerini on Gury, vol. i. n. 28.)

In our view, it is almost impossible to exaggerate the momentousness of this whole doctrine, for the true moral appreciation, whether of those outside the Church, or of obdurate sinners within her pale. To avoid prolixity, however, we will only consider it in detail, as applicable to the obdurate Catholic whom we were just now describing. He has sunk into so abject and degraded a moral condition, that he appreciatively prefers pretty nearly *every* passing pleasure to God. There is hardly any gratification, at all to his taste, from which he would abstain, rather than gravely offend God. In other words—as the day proceeds—almost every act which he elicits is gravely inordinate and mortally sinful.

The only question to be further raised concerning him is, whether these repeated gravely inordinate adhesions to pleasure are in general formally, no less than materially, mortal; or, in other words, whether he have full proximate power of suspecting their true character. And of this—as a general fact—there can (we conceive) be no fair doubt. We are throughout supposing him not to have abandoned the Faith. It is plain that a Catholic, who for years has absented himself from the Confessional—who is living in what he fully knows to be the persistent and unrelenting violation of God's Laws—has an abiding sense all day long, how degraded and detestable is his mode of acting. He feels all day long that he “is drinking in sin like water;” though he would of course be unable to express in theological terms his protracted course of evil.*

Some of our readers may be disposed at first sight to regard this view of things as startling and paradoxical, because of the large number of instants during which it accounts such men to

* It might be thought at first sight, that there is some similarity between the doctrine which we have submitted in the text concerning obdurate sinners, and that advocated by Pascal in his “Fourth Provincial Letter.” But in truth the full doctrine which we would defend is the very extreme contrary to Pascal's. The direct theme of his Fourth Letter—as laid down in the title—is “Actual Grace;” and he reproaches the Jesuits for maintaining, that “God gives man actual graces under every successive temptation.” For our own part—not only we cleave most firmly to the doctrine here denounced by Pascal—but we are disposed to go further. We are strongly disposed to accept the Fifteenth Canon of the Council of Sens; and to affirm, that “not even a moment passes” while a man is *sui compos* “in which God does not stand at the door” of his heart, “and knock” by His supernatural grace.

We need hardly say, that the Council of Sens was not Ecumenical; but Suarez speaks of its decrees as possessing very great authority. Of course this is not the place for a theological discussion concerning the frequency of Actual Grace. But our readers will observe the close connection of our *theological* doctrine, with the doctrine which we have defended in the text, on the constant urgency of man's Moral Voice in the *natural* order.

be formally committing mortal sin. But to our mind, it is precisely on this ground that any *other* view ought rather to be considered startling and paradoxical; as we pointed out a page or two back. The unrepentant *novice* in sin (before his conscience became obdurate) was most indubitably committing mortal sin during pretty nearly the whole of his waking life. It would surely be startling and paradoxical indeed, if his acts *ceased* to be mortally sinful, merely because (through a course of unscrupulous indulgence) he has come to treat his indifference to God's Commandments as a simple matter of course.

This doctrine of "grave inordination" is (as we just now said) entirely applicable to solving the other difficulties we have mentioned; to appreciating the sins of pride and worldliness so widely found among non-Catholic Theists; to appreciating the various sins of fanaticism and self-deception; and, lastly, to appreciating also the moral position of Antitheistic infidels. It would occupy however, considerable space duly to develop and apply the doctrine for this purpose; and we must therefore abandon all attempt at doing so. In regard indeed to the last-named class, a certain theological point needs to be considered: because it may be suggested that—since mortal sin derives its characteristic malignity from its being an offence against God—those who deny His Existence cannot possibly commit it. This whole matter however has been amply discussed by theologians, since a certain proposition was condemned concerning "Philosophical Sin." For our own part therefore we will but briefly express our own adhesion to those theologians—of whom Viva may be taken as a representative instance—who hold, that the recognition of acts as being intrinsically wicked, is *ipso facto* a recognition of them as being offences against the paramount claims of God as rightful Supreme Legislator; and that this recognition suffices for their mortally sinful character.

Otherwise what we have generally to say about these Anti-theists is this. We assume the truth of our own doctrine, as exhibited in the preceding pages. But if this doctrine be true—if God have really granted to all men a self-intimate sense of Free Will—if He have really endowed them with an ineffaceable intuition of right and wrong—if He is constantly pleading within them in favour of virtue — He has, by so acting, invested them with a truly awful moral responsibility. And it is perfectly absurd to suppose, that a set of rebels can evade that responsibility, by the easy process of shutting their eyes to manifest facts. It will fall within the scope of the article which we propose for next January, to show in detail the monstrous inconsistency which exists between the doctrine which these unhappy men theoretically profess, and that which they practically imply

in their whole habitual unstudied language concerning human action.

In concluding our lengthy discussion, we must once more say how entirely we submit all that we have suggested to the judgment of theologians. We indulge the hope however, that—even where we may have unwarily fallen into error—we shall nevertheless have done good service, by obtaining for some of the points we have raised more prominent and scientific consideration, than (we think) they have hitherto received.

And there is a further matter concerning Free Will, on which a word must be added. One principal argument of Determinists is, that the Free Will doctrine would on one hand make psychological science impossible; while on the other hand it would derange the whole practical machinery of life, by proclaiming the inability to predict future human actions. Now it might be thought that what we have now been urging on the *extent* of Free Will, must strengthen the Determinist objection. But facts are not so at all. The chief passages in which we replied to it appeared in April, 1867, pp. 288–290; and in April, 1874, pp. 353–4. And if our readers will kindly refer to those pages, they will see that our answer is as simply applicable in defence of our own present thesis, as in defence of any more limited Libertarian theory which can possibly be devised.

Here at length we bid farewell (for a considerable time at least) to the Free Will controversy. We hope to have a paper ready for next January, on “Agnosticism as such.” And we hope to begin it by a few pages—mainly taken from Ollé Lapruné’s invaluable work on “Moral Certitude”—in which we shall consider what are those principles of investigation, which lead to the establishment of certain knowledge on those all-important religious truths, which are within the sphere of human reason.

W. G. WARD.

ART. III.—THE REORGANIZATION OF OUR ARMY.

NO one gifted with the ordinary amount of observation, and who has watched for a series of years the course of public events in England, can come to any other conclusion than that in the matter of administrative reforms we are the most injudicious of civilized nations. No amount of abuses, and no quantity of exposures respecting abuses, seem to have any influence on the public mind for a long series of years. Things are allowed to go their own way, no matter how much evil they

entail. We seem to trust a good deal to chance, and the rest to Providence, in affairs which require only a little energy and a small amount of reform to set right. No matter what may be the amount of evil which a want of reform may cause, we are content to "let things slide," as the Americans say: and to congratulate ourselves on the supposed fact that "they will last our time." And so, until some flagrant case occurs in which national honour, or a large sum of money, or human life is forfeited to our apathy, we let matters take their own course and shift for themselves. At last a crisis arrives. For some reason or other we recognize distinctly that we have been persistently following a road which must lead us on the wrong direction. Then comes the reaction. We rush into impossible reforms with as much persistency as we before continued on the wrong track. Every charlatan who has a theory of his own to propound is listened to; and the greater the change from what has been to what is to be, the more firmly are we impressed with the idea that at last the right and true way of arriving at the desired end has been found.

No better illustration of the foregoing could be found than in all that regards the reorganization of the army. For nearly half a century—from the end of the great war with France in 1815, until 1871-72—no army reform, or change of any sort or kind with regard to the services, was even so much as thought of by our military authorities. Abuses in the service existed, as they will, and must, exist in all human institutions, and were by no means few in number. From time to time these were pointed out by men of experience in the army, and changes of a decided, although not a sweeping, character were advocated. It was urged again and again by writers in various magazines and newspapers, that a body of officers who not only obtained their first commissions, but also subsequent promotion, without any kind of examination—not even a medical one—as to their fitness for the service, was an anomaly, which made ours the laughing-stock of other armies. It was argued that to appoint a man to a regiment of cavalry because he could pay £840 for his cornetcy, or to a corps of infantry because he or his friends could command the sum of £450, was a practice by no means in keeping with the spirit of the age. It did not need much argument to prove that the rule by which, when an officer became senior of his rank, and a vacancy taking place in the rank above him, he could not be promoted unless he was prepared to pay down a considerable sum of money for his step, the next officer below him passed over his head, was not exactly a regulation which did our army much credit. These, and many other abuses which had in the course of time become law, were denounced as requiring immediate alteration; but all to no purpose whatever. The rule of the War Office and Horse Guards

seemed to be that "whatever is, is right," and all sorts of reforms were denounced as inadmissible. At last the change came. It was only in 1849 that certain very mild examinations were made indispensable, both for those who were appointed to the army, and such as obtained promotion in the service. Nearly ten years later—after the Crimean War—these examinations were made harder than before; but still there was nothing to complain of in the ordeal which officers had to go through. After a time an alteration came, and, to use a vulgar expression, it came with a rush. The Franco-German War of 1870-71 surprised others besides the great nation that lost so much of its former prestige in that memorable struggle—if, indeed, that can be called a struggle, in which victory from the very first is with one army, and during which every week, nay, every day, adds to the laurels those troops had already gained. The Germans carried everything before them from the day they set foot in France; and the rest of Europe bore testimony to the truth of the saying, that "nothing succeeds like success." In England, army reform and army reorganization became simply a national mania. We tried our best to make our troops as like as possible to those of Germany. With one simple exception, every change we attempted was a mistake, every reform a most decided blunder. The abolition of the purchase system was certainly a step in the right direction; the only wonder being that so great a national disgrace had been allowed to remain part and parcel of our military code until the nineteenth century was upwards of seventy years old. Already, although barely a decade has passed since what may be called "the Banker's Book qualification," for appointments to, and for promotions when in, the service has been abolished, we look back with wonder that such a rule could ever have existed, and with still greater amazement that earnest men could ever have been found who were strongly opposed to its being done away with. But here our praise of army reform during the last ten years must cease. With the single exception of the abolition of purchase, all that has been effected in the way of change has simply and gravely deteriorated the service in every possible way. And not only this. If we are to judge of the future by the past, the time is not very far distant when we shall have no army at all; or, at any rate, when the greatly diminished number and quality of our troops will reduce us to the level of a third-class European kingdom and power.

On the 11th of May last, the Aldershot division of the army paraded before Her Majesty. The nominal strength of this division—the strength *on paper*—is 10,500 of all ranks. There were present on this occasion two troops of Horse Artillery; two regiments of Heavy Dragoons, and one of

Hussars; five batteries of Foot Artillery; one mounted and one dismounted company of Engineers, and ten battalions of Infantry. If all the different corps there had been of the strength which they are supposed, and are said to be, there would not have been less than between 10,000 to 12,000 men on parade. But for reasons of which we shall make due mention presently, the whole division mustered but 5,712 of all ranks, or not so many men as a single German or French brigade would have done, and about 3,000 fewer than the ten infantry regiments present would have had on parade a few years ago, before the short service system came into vogue. To call some, nay, with two exceptions, any of the infantry corps that paraded before the Queen on the above-named occasion by the name of regiments, would be simple irony. Thus, of a nominal strength of some 1,500 men and horses, the three cavalry regiments only mustered 869 sabres; whilst of between 7,000 and 8,000 men that ought to have been present with the ten infantry battalions, there were less than 4,000, all told.* Of all these ten corps there were only two—viz., the 2nd battalion of the 18th Royal Irish, and the 93rd Highlanders, which mustered in anything like respectable numbers, the former having 673, the latter 536 men under arms. On the other hand, the 32nd Light Infantry, which has on its rolls 673 men, could only muster 283 on parade; the famous 42nd Highlanders only 290 out of 610; and the 1st battalion of the 2nd Queen's not more than 287 out of 640. And yet this was a parade before Her Majesty, at which every available soldier would be present.

The question naturally arises, where were the other men who ought to have been under arms on this occasion? The answer requires some little knowledge of what is behind the scenes of regimental life in these days. The fact is, that under our present military system we do not, and cannot, get recruits to fill up the cadres of our regiments, and are obliged to make shift as occasion demands. When a battalion is ordered on foreign service it is almost certain to be under the strength required for a corps in the field. It is therefore made up by volunteers from other regiments, and in nineteen cases out of twenty, it embarks for India, the Cape, or wherever it may be going, with at least half of its men who do not know their officers, who do not know each other, and whose officers do not know them. Surely it is not a harsh thing to say that most, if not all, the several small defeats we have met with of late years in different parts of the world may be justly attributed to this cause?

Another reason for the paucity of soldiers in our ranks is, that by far the greater number of the recruits we get are too young

* *Standard*, May 12, 1881.

found it utterly impossible to do so. The country will stand a good deal in the way of strange legislation, but compulsory service is what never did, and never will, be accepted by Englishmen. No other country in the whole world gives, or ever gave, a tenth of the number of volunteers for service that we do; but our fellow countrymen would never be *compelled* to take service. However, if these gentlemen could not have conscription, they were resolved to have everything else that Continental armies rejoice in; and of these, the first and chief would be limited enlistment, and a Reserve Force which could be called under arms when wanted at a day's notice.

Now, in my humble opinion, there are two insurmountable objections to both these alterations in our military organizations. To begin with, our army is infinitely more a Colonial, or an Indian force than it is a European one. We don't want a large number of troops, either to keep revolutionists in order, or to be prepared against foreign invasion. What we do require are steady, seasoned battalions, ready to embark for any part of the world at a day's warning, composed of men who can do us good service in any war which may take place in our Indian Empire or any of our Colonies. Other countries have quite different wants from ours. With the single exception of Algeria, neither France, Germany, Italy, nor Austria, has any foreign land which it has to protect and keep in order by means of their own troops. They have to be prepared against invasion from other powers, and to be ever ready to repel an enemy. With them conscription, the training of young men to the use of arms, and the necessary consequences of a reserve, are matters of vital importance. For them a reserve is a reality as well as a necessity. Their peasants, and even their working men, seldom, if ever, leave the district, the village—nay, rarely the very house—in which they were born. But it is far otherwise with us. The English working man is by nature, to say nothing of inclination, a wanderer on the face of the earth. He may be a native of Liverpool or Manchester. If he finds work in the town he was born in, he remains there; if not, he goes to Newcastle, or comes to London, or perhaps emigrates to Canada, the States, Australia, or New Zealand. In Germany, France, and all other European countries, every citizen is registered, and if he changes his abode he must give notice of the same to the authorities, unless he has passed the age when he is liable to be called on to serve. When the war of 1870 broke out, Germans who were in business, or serving as clerks in London, Paris, New York, Chicago, New Orleans, and San Francisco, were summoned by telegrams to the different German consuls, to report themselves at the headquarters of their respective *corps d'armée*, and with a few very

rare exceptions they did so. Their different whereabouts in the furthest off foreign lands were as well known as if they had never left the immediate neighbourhood of Berlin, Munich, Frankfort, or Bremen. I remember, after the terrible battle of Wörth was over, and MacMahon's *corps d'armée* was in full retreat for the Vosges, assisting a German corporal of dragoons, who was fearfully wounded, and who asked me to procure a priest to give him the last sacraments. I did so, and in less than half an hour after receiving the Viaticum he expired. But before his death he gave me a letter to post to his wife at San Francisco, and asked me to write and tell her he had died as a Catholic ought. This same gentleman—for by his manners and conversation he showed himself to be such, and he spoke English almost as well as I did—told me that he had been for some years at the head of a prosperous firm in the Far West of America; that he was, however, still liable to be called on to serve in the army, as he belonged to the reserve. He had been summoned to Cologne by a cable telegram to his consul in San Francisco, and had obeyed the order. Had he not done so he would have forfeited all his civil rights as a German citizen. And he informed me—what I afterwards found to be the case—that there were some hundreds of his fellow-countrymen who, like himself, had come from different parts of the world to take up arms at the call of the Government. Would Englishmen, Irishmen, or Scotchmen submit to be so ruled? I think not. We are ready enough to enlist for any thing, for any service, or for any danger, but it must be of our own free will that we do so. And unless an Army Reserve can be counted upon to the extent of at least ninety per cent. as certain to turn up when wanted, it is of no use whatever in the day of trouble. An officer on Manteuffel's staff told me that throughout the different German camps, the average of reserve men who did not put in an appearance, when called upon to join their respective regiments when the war broke out, was a fraction under three per cent.; I wonder how many there would be of our English Reserve who would answer their names if called upon to take up arms. It would not be from cowardice that they failed; but simply because they had gone away and could not be found.

No; what we wanted in the way of reorganization of our army was not a mere bad imitation of the German system, but certain amendments and reforms suitable for our own wants. The base upon which our regimental system is built is the *esprit de corps*, which only those who have been in active service, and have done years of regimental duty, do, or can understand. That *esprit de corps* the late reorganization of the army has all but, if not quite, destroyed. The reason is very plain to those who are, or

who have been, behind the scenes. Unfortunately for the country our army reformers are, with few exceptions, staff officers, the majority of whom know little or nothing of regimental work; and what little experience they may have had of it they seem to take a pride in forgetting. With them—or at any rate with most of them—the army, and all that belongs to it, exists upon paper. Their pride is in their “Returns,” “Reports,” “General Orders,” and “Field States,” not in the men, the horses, or the drill of their companies, troops, squadrons, or regiments. Had the reorganization of the army been the work of officers with regimental experience, it would have been a very different affair from the “meddle and muddle” changes which the service has been subject to for the last ten years, and of which the end seems as far from being visible as ever. But, so long as the tax-paying public is pleased with the condition of our troops, what right has any one to grumble? With the exception of the *Army and Navy Gazette* there was not a single London paper that did not publish a gushing article about the review before Her Majesty on the 11th May last. Some persons may perhaps be of opinion that this praise of what was simply a display of our national military weakness only showed ignorance of the subject. As a matter of course the day will come—in such cases it always does—when the series of blunders which our military chiefs have sanctioned will be made clear to the general public, and then the scare will in all probability bring about changes which will be, if possible, worse than the evils now complained of. And yet that would be difficult. If the most complete division of the British army at home—the force we should look to in the event of any sudden war—cannot muster for a parade before the Queen of England more than 5,700 men out of a nominal strength of 10,500, where is it possible to look for troops in the day of national trials or troubles?

As regards regimental officers, the reorganization of our army has, if possible, done more harm and worked more effectually to destroy the old *esprit de corps* which was so marked throughout the service, than has been the case with the rank and file. The abolition of the purchase system was, as I have said before, a reform which can hardly be too much praised. If the War Office had then left matters alone, regimental promotion would by degrees have regulated itself. But there seems to have been, and there is still, a dreadful fright lest officers should remain in the service too long. With a view to prevent this, two regulations have been adopted, which would do credit to the bitterest enemy this country ever had, for they have gone far, and will go further still, to destroy the efficiency of the service, to make officers discontented with their lot, and to increase the want of

personal knowledge which the commissioned ranks used to have of their men, and which the rank and file formerly had of their officers. The two rules I allude to are: first, that which makes it obligatory for the commanding officer of a regiment to retire upon half-pay after he has commanded his corps for five years; and, secondly, that which forces every captain of the age of forty to leave the service, take his pension, and, although barely in his prime, to become an idle man for the rest of his life. It would be very difficult to say which of these regulations has done, or will hereafter do, more harm—which of the two is more calculated to subvert and destroy that love of the corps which was the distinguishing mark of ninety-nine out of every hundred regimental officers in the British army. To begin with, it requires no great experience of army life to know that it takes a commanding officer at least a couple of years before he feels confidence in himself, and is able to command the regiment with credit to himself and advantage to the service. In the English army the officers of a corps live in almost perfect equality when off duty. The only exception to this rule is the commanding officer. When the senior major of a corps succeeds to the chief post in that corps, it takes him some little time—some few months, or perhaps a year—before he can, without offending his former associates and comrades, cast off all intimacy with them. It is also necessary for a commanding officer to be for some time at the head of a regiment before he can command that respect for his orders and wishes that is essential to his command being a success. To direct well a regiment of cavalry, or a battalion of infantry, to acquire a personal knowledge of all the officers and men, and work the whole complicated machine with credit and efficiency, is not an undertaking in which any man can be guided by the mere rules and regulations of the service. To do so well, seems to come as a matter of course to some officers, whilst there are not a few who would never, no matter what amount of experience they had, get through their task with advantage to themselves or the service. With some men the command and direction of their fellows seems to come naturally, but there are others who never can, and never will, acquire the art. Amongst regimental officers the opinion is almost universal that five years at the head of a regiment is much too long a time for a bad commanding officer, and far too short a period for a good one.

Most unfortunately for the British army, the ruling idea of those who have had the reorganization of the service in their hands seems to have been that everything can be done by rule and regulation, and that it is as easy to make a commanding officer efficient by printed orders as it is to determine of what colour the facings of a uniform or the length of a sword-belt ought to

be. There never was—there never could—be a greater mistake as regards the command of those, no matter to what rank in life they belong, who form the component parts of our regiments. With Germans, hard military laws that admit of no deviation whatever, may work well; but they never will do so with English, Irish, or Scotchmen. A good commanding officer can no more be made by “The Mutiny Act,” or “The Queen’s Regulations,” than an able statesman can be formed by studying the volumes of *Hansard*, or by reading the leading articles of the *Times*. To command a corps well and efficiently an officer must not only serve a training to the work; he must possess in no small degree qualifications which will enable him to see that all men are not alike, and that the rule over that complicated machine called a regiment requires judgment, tact, and discretion in no ordinary degree. There are some men who seem specially cut out for the berth and responsibilities of command, whilst there are others who never would acquire the needful qualifications if they were left, not five, but twenty-five years at the head of a corps.

There are some commanding officers upon whom this five years’ rule falls especially hard. Take, for instance, the cases of Colonel Alexander of the 1st Dragoon Guards, and of Lord Ralph Kerr of the 10th Hussars. The former of these two officers obtained command of his regiment in December, 1876. At the end of 1878, or very early in 1879, the corps was ordered out to the Cape, where it has been ever since, broken up into detachments, a portion of it having been since sent on to India. In December of the present year, Colonel Alexander, a man still in the prime of life, must resign his command and go on half pay, after having virtually only had his regiment together for two years. As a matter of course every corps that goes on field service like that in South Africa gets more or less, so to speak, out of form, and has to be in a great measure reformed, and has to be redrilled and remounted when it goes back into quarters. If all goes well at the Cape, and the services of the 1st Dragoon Guards can soon be dispensed with, Colonel Alexander will have just begun to get his regiment into working order once more, when he must lay down his command, and, after an active regimental work extending over thirty-four years, retire into private life, and become an idle man for the rest of his days.

The case of Lord Ralph Kerr is, in some respects, even harder than that of Colonel Alexander. This officer went to India with his corps in 1873. The effects of the climate obliged him to come home on sick leave in 1876, and whilst at home he succeeded to the command of his regiment. He had not recovered from his illness when the 10th was ordered up to the Afghan frontier, and Lord Ralph at once set out from England

to join. He has been with the regiment ever since; but his five years' command has come to an end, and before these lines are in print, on the 31st of May, he will have to retire on half-pay, although barely forty-five years of age; to leave a regiment in which he knows every officer and every trooper, and which he commanded with great credit to himself during a very difficult period in the field.

I have selected the cases of these two officers as peculiarly hard, partly on account of their respective regiments being amongst the first in the Army List, but chiefly because they have both done good service in the field. There are, however, many others whose treatment is equally hard, whose reward for long and faithful service is that they are forced into idleness whilst yet comparatively young men, and just as their experience in regimental life and work might be of the greatest use to the service and to their country.

Some persons might object to the principle I have laid down—viz., that five years is much too long a time for a bad commanding officer to be at the head of a corps, and far too short a period for an efficient and really good man to hold that position. It might be asked who shall, and who can, decide to which category a commanding officer belongs. To this I reply, of what use is a General of Brigade, or Division, if he cannot class the commanding officers who come under his notice? There are such things as half-yearly and annual inspections. Reports to the War Office and the Horse Guards must surely be of some service and use in showing the authorities who are, and who are not, fit and suitable men to command corps. An efficient colonel can hardly hide his light under a bushel, nor can an inefficient one make himself appear other than what he really is. If he attempts to do so, there is always the corps he commands as evidence against him. Englishmen—Celts, as well as Saxons—are much the same, whether they form part of the House of Lords, of the House of Commons, of the professional classes, of the labouring multitude, of the crew of a vessel, or of the officers or men of a regiment. They are the easiest people in the world to rule with a little management, but utterly impossible to govern by hard and forced regulations, like the Germans, and many other European nations. Everything depends upon the individual who rules them. If he is judicious and wise all goes well; if otherwise, everything goes wrong. I have seen—as every man who has served any time in the army must—in the same cantonments in India, and in the same garrison or camp at home, two regiments living under the same rules, governed by the same regulations, and doing exactly the same duty. In the one all would be harmony amongst the officers, and good order and discipline amongst the men; in the

other all would be discord and annoyance and worry in the commissioned ranks, with an utter absence of what a regiment ought to be in the barrack rooms. And yet in both corps the mess and barrack rooms were recruited from amongst the same classes. The reason of such a great difference was that the commanding officer of one regiment was an efficient man, whilst he who was at the head of the other was exactly the reverse.

I have dwelt at some length upon the question of commanding officers, because I believe that it is upon their qualifications that the efficiency of the whole army depends. If all regiments could be well and judiciously commanded, the army which they compose would be perfect. And in exact proportion as they are well or ill commanded, the service is efficient or otherwise. At the same time it is utterly impossible to lay down any rules or regulations by which good commanding officers can be secured. And, as every one of any regimental experience knows well, men fitting and suitable for the post are not so plentiful as might be imagined. In a word, and to repeat what I have said before, five years is much too long a time to entrust a regiment to the care of a weak, inefficient, and above all an injudicious, colonel; and far too short a period for one who has the needful qualifications. I have more than once seen a corps which has been well commanded fall away in six months, or less, from perfect efficiency to exactly the contrary, and this because it had changed a very good for an exceedingly indifferent commander. The five years rule—the rule which makes it imperative upon a commanding officer to retire upon half-pay at the end of five years—is so well calculated to injure the service that it almost seems as if it had been invented by some arch-enemy of this country.

And the same may be said of the new regulation which obliges any captain who has attained the age of forty, and has not yet been presented to a majority, to retire upon a pension. To begin with, the fact of making age an absolute test of efficiency or otherwise, is itself of a very great fallacy. This, too, is one of those hard-and-fast rules which we have copied from the Germans, but which are utterly unsuited to our race and the nature of Englishmen. There are many men of thirty, who, owing to a defective constitution, intemperate living, or other causes, are, in point of fact, older than others who were born ten, or even fifteen years before them. Slow promotion amongst officers is no doubt bad, but it is one of those things which correct themselves; and to avoid which, such an injustice as the one I have pointed out is rather too high a price to pay. Every officer would, as a matter of course, like to obtain the rank of major as quickly as possible. If he is not promoted before he is forty years of age it may be set down as pretty certain that the fault is not his own. To punish

him for his misfortunes—to set him adrift on the world on a small pension, at an age when he is too old to learn any new calling—is a piece of injustice of which we have few examples in British law. What between captains who are forty years of age, and colonels who have commanded corps for five years, we shall soon be like some of the far west States of America, where it is quite exceptional for any one in civil life *not* to have military rank; where the hack carriage is driven by a “colonel,” and a “captain” waits on you at the *table d’hôte* dinner, and a “major” will take a few cents for holding your horse.

But there is another very large class of persons to whom these rules of compulsory retirement from the army ought not to be without interest. What does the British taxpayer say to the increased, and yearly increasing, number of officers, who, although fully able, and, in almost every case, most anxious to remain at their posts, are forced to take a pension, or to retire on half-pay? It is calculated that during the present year no fewer than fifty colonels whose five years of command have expired will be obliged to do this, and that about one hundred and fifty captains, who have attained the age of forty, but who have not yet been promoted to majorities, will be made to take their pension. Let this go on for a few years, and our half-pay list will be very much larger than it was at the end of the war with France—more numerous, in fact, than the list of officers on full-pay.

Nor is this all. Let any one dine at a regimental mess, or mix for a few days with the officers of any corps, and he will at once perceive what a tone of discontent with the present, and of fear for the future, exists in the service. Everlasting, never-ending change of rules, regulations, and warrants, seems to be the order of the day at the War Office; so much so that no one knows or can form any idea what a day may bring forth. An officer has, let us say, entered the service at nineteen or twenty years of age. At thirty-six or seven he finds himself well up the list of captains, but knows that it will be at least five or six years before he can be promoted to a majority. In olden days he would have looked upon himself as a very fortunate individual; but now he is of all men the most miserable. He is unhappy by anticipation, for he is aware that in two or three years, as the case may be, he will be obliged to retire from a service that it is his pride and his glory to belong to, in which he has spent the best years of his life, and in which he hoped to gain honours and reward in his old age. He is still young; but he is obliged to leave his regiment, and to be an idle man for the future. It is true that the time when he must do this is still a year or two off; but the anticipation of the evil renders him inefficient for present duties; or at any rate he does not perform his work with the same zeal and activity as he

used to. And as there are two or three captains who come under this rule in almost every regiment—two or three men who see that they must become idlers on the face of the earth long years before old age shall have overtaken them—who will say that the service in general is not affected for the bad by such a rule? I was always an enemy of the old purchase system, and believe that it was an excellent thing for the army when it was abolished; but candour compels me to admit that, with all its many drawbacks and imperfections, promotion by purchase did not bring about anything like as many evils as the compulsory retirement of captains when forty years of age has done and will yet do. A more unwise or unjust regulation it would, indeed, be difficult for the brain of man to devise. Like the rest of our new rules for the reorganization of the army, it would really seem as if the destruction of all *esprit de corps*, and of whatever has hitherto made our regiments what they are, and not the greater efficiency of the service, was what those aimed at who framed the greater number of the regulations which have appeared since 1871-72—which was about the time when our military authorities became inoculated with an intense admiration of the German army, and, so far as can be judged by their actions, determined to make our own a bad imitation of that service.

It seems that we are now on the eve of another change in what has in the last decade been altered, and re-altered, so often. The old familiar names and numbers of our regiments are to be done away with, and the army is now to be divided into what are to be called "territorial regiments." To criticize too severely a scheme that has yet to be tried would be unfair. But this new reorganization of the service bears upon the face of it not a little that is in every way most objectionable. To begin with, it is a removal of old landmarks, old designations, and old titles by which almost every regiment in the service has been known for the best part of a century, and some for even longer. Again, it seems almost like a bad practical joke, in so small a country as the United Kingdom, to designate regiments as belonging exclusively to one district, or town, or country. As I said before, the classes from which the rank and file of our army are recruited are wanderers over the country, and very often over the whole earth. An illustration of this occurred to a friend of mine last year. He was watching a Scotch militia regiment at Church parade, and was surprised to see that, out of some six hundred and odd men, upwards of a hundred were marched to the Catholic Chapel. He said to one of the officers that he had no idea there were so many Catholics in a Scotch Lowland country, but was told that of those on their way to hear mass, not more than five or six were Scotchmen, the rest being one and all Irish. And so

it is with every battalion, either of regulars or auxiliary troops in the land. Such a thing as a regiment of which, not all, but even a considerable portion, belong to the same county, does not exist; and I question whether it ever will. Our army is one of volunteers. It is not, and never will be, raised by conscription. We must take our men as we can, and as we find them willing to enlist. To imagine that a London artisan will join a regiment any the more readily because it is called "The Royal Middlesex;" or that a Preston mill-hand, out of work, will prefer "The Lancashire" to "The Yorkshire," or "The Lincolnshire" regiment, is sheer folly. If the War Office authorities take upon themselves to direct that men are only to be enlisted for the corps which bears the name of the town, or shire, or district of which they are natives, the result will simply be that our recruiting will come to a standstill, and we shall not even get as many men as we do now. My own experience, which extended over fourteen years in the service, half spent in an infantry and half in a cavalry regiment, taught me that the best men we used to get for the army were those who came from a distance to enlist, and not those who joined the regiments stationed in the towns where they resided. And still better—of a better class—were those who enlisted for the old local Indian regiments, and who cast in their lot with corps that were permanently stationed in a far-off land.

If, instead of the many new fangled organizations which have been ordered during the past ten years, the War Office had spent a fourth of the money that has been wasted upon attempting to Germanize our army, in giving our men better pay and providing good pensions for them in their old age, the service would be in a very different condition from what it now is. Our recruits ought not to enlist before they are twenty years of age, and their engagement ought to be for at least fifteen years. A trained, drilled, and disciplined soldier of from thirty to thirty-five years of age is worth two, if not three, of the raw lads, without stamina or strength, who now fill our ranks, and who leave the service to join that military myth called "The Reserve," just as they come to an age when they can do good work. This is more especially the case in India, where, until a soldier is acclimatized, he is almost useless for real active service. I remember many years ago, when on service in Upper Scinde with the 40th Regiment, a sudden order being given for the corps to proceed at once to relieve a native infantry detachment that was surrounded by the enemy. Before starting, the commanding officer ordered that all men who had not been two years in India should be left behind with the sick. We marched out of camp about 5 P.M., and in sixteen hours had reached our destination, a distance of

fifty-two miles off. It was terribly hard work. For twenty odd miles our route was across a desert, in which not a drop of water was to be found. We halted every hour, and twice during the night stopped long enough to make some coffee for the men. The result of the precaution taken by our commanding officer was that in a battalion eight hundred strong, there were only eleven men who had to fall out during the whole march; and of these it was discovered that four had only been out of hospital a very few days, but had managed to join their companies before the regiment marched. Could such a feat be performed by any of the battalions filled with mere lads, as all our regiments have been since the Limited Enlistment Act came into full operation? To this question there can be but one answer.

In a country like England, where industrial enterprises are so numerous, and where there is a constant demand for steady middle-aged men to fill various situations of trust—situations in which education of a high standard is not essential—it would not be difficult to provide for our discharged soldiers. The London Corps of Commissionaires is a proof of this. And it is a standing shame to our Government that something of the kind has never yet been taken in hand by the War Office. Moreover, veterans who have done their work ought not to be left without a pension which would provide them with every reasonable comfort when they get old.

Another anomaly—or, to speak more plainly, a great national disgrace, and a decided hindrance towards our ever recruiting the quantity and the quality of men which we might otherwise enlist for the service—is the way in which our soldiers' wives, and, still worse, their widows, are treated. It is acknowledged that the best soldiers we have are the married men; or at least such used to be the case before the present system of enlisting mere boys and sending them away before they become men came into force. We used to, and we do still for that matter, allow a certain number of the men to marry. But when these had to be ordered abroad with their regiments, their wives and children were left to the mercy of the charitable, or to the care of those who liked to look after them. To their credit be it said, the present Government has intimated that a provision for soldiers' wives and children will be included in the army estimates for the present year; a measure that has certainly not been determined upon before time. Had this been done twenty or thirty years ago a vast deal of money that has been lost through desertions, and the punishments brought about by that offence, would have been saved to the country. Even as it is there is no certain provision of any kind for the widows and orphans of soldiers who die in the service; but it is to be hoped that, if the mania for Germanizing

the service comes to an end, and common sense prevails, we shall see these poor women and children saved from having to go on the parish when their husbands and fathers die, or are killed, in the service of their country.

If we may put any faith in the old adage, that "what everybody says must be true," no man in England is more opposed to the reorganization of the service on the German system than the Duke of Cambridge, Commander-in-Chief of the British army. And it must be admitted that, wherever and whenever the Duke has had an opportunity during the last few years, he has given utterance to words which, when one reads between the lines, fully corroborate what the world believes his views to be. One thing His Royal Highness has several times—and once, in particular, at a dinner given at the Mansion House about eighteen months ago—insisted upon. It is, as I said before, that our army is not like that of any other European nation. The army corps, divisions, brigades, and regiments of other nations, to say nothing of their system of conscription and the men they have on reserve, are formed for the purpose of defending their own frontiers from the invasion of their neighbours. Our regiments, on the other hand, are almost entirely kept up for the purpose of maintaining our colonies, and preserving the latter in our possession, free from internal as well as external foes. Our forces at home are recruiting depôts, from which our troops in India and the other parts of the Empire are, so to speak, to be fed. When a regiment comes home it remains in the United Kingdom a certain number of years for the purpose of regaining its strength and numbers, and qualifying for service abroad. Nothing is more improbable—I might almost say impossible—than an invasion of this country by any foreign Power. But, supposing for an instant that such an event did happen, it is not only upon our regular troops that we should depend. To begin with, the enemy would find a very awkward adversary to contend with in the fleet. But should the invader land on our shores, what would be the result? This same question, almost in these very words, was put to me by a German officer the day after the taking of Sedan, when he and so many of his fellow-countrymen were drunk with the insolence of victory. And what I said to that individual—who was polite enough to tell me that before many years were over these Islands would have to submit to the German legions as France had been forced to do—I repeat here, viz., that thousands might invade this country, but barely units would ever return alive. To say nothing of a militia, volunteers, and the regulars we have at home, the nation would rise as one man, and those we could not kill in battle, our very women and children

would poison in the food they eat and the water they drank. When talking of the defence of our country, we should not forget that the volunteers form a body of men most admirably adapted for this work. It is all very well for a certain school of military Germanizers—men who believe that every soldierlike ordinance in this world comes forth from Germany—to despise and sneer at a force of men who give up so much of their time to learn the art of soldiery and the means of using their rifles. But from what I have seen of the much-be-praised soldiers who invaded France with such success, I would rather have fifty average English or Scotch volunteers behind me in the event of a deadly struggle, than twice that number of Prussians, Bavarians, or Saxons. There is no institution, military or civil, that foreigners wonder at, and admire so much, as our volunteers; and yet there is no body of men kept so much in the background. The authorities seem never tired of washing our dirty linen in the shape of battalions only two or three hundred strong before the whole world, but they appear to shun showing strangers a body of men who, when the conditions under which they engage, their numbers, and their proficiency in their work, are taken into consideration, must certainly be regarded as the finest and most patriotic body of men that any country has ever seen. Of these, as indeed of all our forces, whether regular, militia, or volunteers, may we truly apply the words of Marshal (General) Soult to a relative of mine, who was taken prisoner by the French on the retreat to Corunna. "Your men," said the marshal, speaking of the English troops, "have one quality which will always make them good soldiers under all circumstances—they invariably obey their officers."

That a certain amount of reorganization was, and is still, required in our army there can be no doubt whatever. Every human institution must from time to time be more or less changed or reformed. But in England we have made the great mistake of taking as what we should imitate military institutions, with which our own have little, if anything, in common. A German and an English soldier are no more like each other than an English farm labourer is like an Italian vine-dresser. On this part alone of my subject a volume of considerable size might be written. Take a single instance of the discipline in the two armies. I remember seeing, a few hours after the battle of Wörth was over, a party of German infantry paraded for guard duty. One of the men had his belts dirty, or his accoutrements in bad order, upon which the officer inspecting the detachment very coolly *slapped the offender's face*. Would such a thing be possible in our own service? And yet there has been introduced into our military system during the last ten years anomalies which, to an

English military man, are nearly as outrageous as this. Take, for instance, certain pages which have been officially inserted in our "Army List" for the last few years, headed "Mobilization of the Forces at Home." Let no Englishman, on any account, who has a spark of patriotism in him, allow any foreign friend who understands English to see this extraordinary document, which reads like a bad joke, or an untimely squib on the army. In it will be found a very pretty distribution of no less than eight—purely imaginary—"Army Corps;" but with this trifling shortcoming, namely, that these Corps have imaginary divisions, which have—also imaginary—brigades; and the latter are chiefly composed of regiments stationed anywhere in the kingdom. One example of this will be enough. I have before me a list of "The First Army Corps," of which the head-quarters are at Colchester. In the first brigade of the First Division, the three battalions which compose the brigade are certainly stationed at Colchester. But as regards the second brigade of the same Division, the three battalions are stationed at Fermoy, Castlebar, and at Buttevant! Again, the first brigade of the Second Division of the same corps has its head-quarters at Chelmsford; but the three battalions composing that brigade are at the Curragh, at Tipperary, and at Birr.* And this is called the "Mobilization of the Forces at Home." Let us hope that when the scheme of the new territorial army is matured it will be found free from such follies and absurdities as what I have here pointed out.

Want of space prevents me from even giving an outline of what has been, and what ought to be, done with regard to the reorganization of our Indian army. It was my lot, after an absence of twenty years from the East, to revisit that country in 1875-76, as one of the Special Correspondents with His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. What I saw of our army there as it is, and as compared with what it was in former days, I will, with the permission of the Editor, give an account of in a future Number of this Review. For the present I can only hope to have made it pretty clear that the reorganization of our Home Forces, so far, and in the direction it has been carried out up to the present time, is, to say the least of it, in every way simply a series of military blunders.

M. LAING MEASON.

* See Hart's "Army List," January, 1881, p. 66

ART. IV.—RECENT WORKS ON THE STATE OF GERMANY

IN THE FIFTEENTH AND BEGINNING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY,
BY GERMAN AUTHORS.

HISTORICAL literature in Germany has for some time past been stamped with a certain hostile exasperation against the Catholic Church, which will remain for some years a blot on the profound erudition of a country we are accustomed to look upon as a centre of learning. The unity of Germany effected since the war of 1870-1871 cannot be considered the direct cause of certain erroneous exaggerations in matters of history: yet the two facts are really connected.

It is no secret that at the proclamation of the Empire on the victorious conclusion of the war, Pius IX. made the first advances towards friendly relations with the new Imperial throne; it is also known that these advances were received with coldness, not to say contempt, at the Court of Berlin, and that the German Government lent all its power to protect and foster a schism in the Catholic Church by at once granting a pension of several thousand thalers to Dr. Reinkens, elected bishop by a few hundred Catholics who protested against the dogma of the Infallibility.

Several writers, following in Dr. Reinken's footsteps, have devoted their energies to seeking proofs that a protestation against the Church, which might appropriately be styled "Old Catholicism," existed a hundred years ago, and continued through all the Middle Ages; and that, beginning at Claudius of Turin and Hincmar of Rheims, the line of "Old Catholic" bishops has never been interrupted. Truly these historians see "Old Catholicism" everywhere—in the antagonists of Gregory VII. as well as in those of Boniface VIII.

During the last three years we have been gaining ground. The troubled waters are settling into calm, and from the still deep have risen a series of writers who, lifting their voice, have proclaimed certain historical facts too long hidden, and certain details relating to the Church and to civilization never known till to-day.

Their works, far from being controversial, are but a simple exposition of facts, related with the truthfulness of a conscientious historian, and grouped with the eye and appreciation of an artist. They acknowledge frankly the faults of eminent men, regardless of their rank in history. They describe, they paint, they delineate with photographic minuteness even, but they do not

disguise. This straightforwardness, which commends itself specially to the English mind, can in the end, indeed, but prove favourable to the Church and to the civilized and duly instructed section of mankind.

The appreciation of the public is proved by the fact that Dr. Janssen's* work, which we here place first, has run through five editions in three years. The title of his work is "History of the German People from the end of the Middle Ages."† The second volume appeared in 1879, and continues the history of civilization down to the year 1525, including the great social disturbance occasioned by the "Reformation" and other causes.

Other works have been published quite lately containing certain biographical details which Dr. Janssen could only glance at, and they form an admirable amplification of his History of the German People and their Civilization. The Abbé Dacheux, rector of Neudorff-bei-Strassburg, has written the biography of John Geiler,‡ the famous preacher who lived at the end of the fifteenth century. Herr Höfler, professor at the University of Prague, and the Abbé Lederer, have given us the biography of two men, renowned church-administrators in the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries. Professor Höfler, after devoting several years to the study of his subject, has published the biography of Hadrian VI., a native of Holland.§ The Abbé Lederer, in answer to a question given at an examination by the Würzburg University, wrote the life of John, Cardinal Torquemada, the great upholder of the Papacy in its struggle against the decrees of the Councils of Constance, Basle, &c. &c.||

Lastly, Herr Pastor, Doctor of Historical Science, and "privat docent" at the University of Innsbruck, publishes a work in which he describes the efforts made by Charles V., in the first

* The Abbé Janssen, professor at Frankfort, has just been raised by Leo XIII. to the dignity of Apostolic Protonotary.

† "Geschichte des deutschen Volkes, seit dem Ausgange des Mittelalters." Erster Band: Deutschlands allgemeine Zustände beim Ausgang des Mittelalters; 6^e Auflage. Zweiter Band: vom Beginne der politisch-kirchlichen Revolution bis zum Ausgang der socialen Revolution von 1525. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1880 and 1879. 1st vol., price 6 mks. 60; 2nd vol., price 6 mks. 30.

‡ "A Catholic Reformer at the end of the Fifteenth Century: John Geiler, of Kaisersberg, Preacher at the Cathedral of Strassburg, 1478-1510. A Study of his Life and Times." Paris: Ch. Delagrave; Strassburg: Derivaux, 1876. Price, 7 mks. 50.

§ "Pabst Adrian VI., 1522-1523," von Constantin Ritter von Höfler. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1880.

|| "Der Spanische Cardinal Johann von Torquemada sein Leben und sein Schriften," gekrönte Preisschrift von Dr. Stephan Lederer, Katholischer Pfarrer. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1878. 3 mks. 40.

place, to reunite within the pale of the Church the Princes and States threatened with schism from the time of Luther's preaching. The work of this promising young author is the chronological complement of Dr. Janssen's history; it does not, however, in the least forestall the promised continuation in four volumes of the former work. The title of Herr Pastor's work is, "Efforts for Reunion."*

Other Catholic authors have by their several writings completed the study of this particular period; as, for instance, the Abbé Gams in the third volume of his "History of the Church in Spain;"† the first volume of which appeared in 1862, and the last in 1879.

We will now take a hasty glance at the advance made in historical research as represented by the works mentioned above. We will first point out how each is the complement of the others.

Dr. Janssen's aim in his first volume is to exhibit the grand qualities of the fifteenth century, and to prove that, in spite of abuses and errors prevalent in various classes of society, art and science flourished, the piety of the middle class was very intense, preaching of the Word of God was frequent and general, schools and education were prosperous. This is the bright side of the period. In the second volume he proves that the religious and social disturbance caused by the so-called "Reformation" put a sudden stop to the advance of civilization.

The Abbé Dacheux's aim is different. His hero, John Geiler, was born at Schaffhausen, in Switzerland, in 1445, and died at Strassburg in 1510, after having officiated as preacher at the Cathedral from 1478. He did not live to see the effects of the Lutheran "Reformation," but he devoted his whole life to the real reform of abuses which had crept into church administration, as well as into the liberties and privileges of the great secular princes. John Geiler was a living protest against all the irregularities of his time. In his works, preaching and life we have presented to us the dark side of the latter half of the fifteenth century.

In the same way Herr Pastor fills up the sketch contained in Dr. Janssen's second volume (1523-1525). Dr. Janssen describes, with fearful truth, the consequences of the revolution in the beginning of the sixteenth century, while Herr Pastor unfolds a more consoling and refreshing canvas depicting the

* "Die Kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen, während der Regierung Karls V. aus der quellen dargestellt." Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1879. Mks. 7.

† "Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien." Dritter Band: 1^e Abtheilung (1055-1492) 1876; 2^e Abtheilung (1492-1879) 1879. Regensburg: Joseph Manz. 460 & 570 pp.; each vol. 9s.

efforts made by the Emperor and the Sovereign Pontiffs to pacify the Empire and the Church, and to restore peace and prosperity to States "on which the sun never set." These efforts, nevertheless, were often quite barren. In the midst of this turmoil and agitation, surrounded by the intrigues of the French Court, by the fearful boldness and cynicism of Luther, the aspirations—too often ambitious—of the Court at Madrid, rises up the grand figure of Hadrian VI., as painted by Herr Höfler. Hadrian, who was the victim of political complications engendered by the Reformation, and who in a reign of two years was crushed under the weight of cares imposed upon him by men who, detesting heresy, would yet not forego their own cupidity and worldly ambition; was borne down by his labours for the restoration of peace, which he sought with a disinterestedness very different from that of the Emperor.

We will now give some details in explanation of these generalities, and taking Dr. Janssen's work as a centre we will group around it the works of the other writers.

In the first book (pp. 1–132) our author describes the state of learning in Germany at the period of the invention of printing, and takes Cardinal Nicholas Krebs, a native of Cues on the Moselle, near Treves, and known under the name of Cusanus, as the typical representative of the time. This famous man was, as a Church reformer, the counterpart of John Geiler; but as a man of science he was his superior, for at one and the same time he gave a fresh impetus to the study of theology and philosophy, to physics and mathematics, being himself, meanwhile, engaged with politics. His method, propagated in the name of the Holy See, was a reform inaugurated by the reorganization and restoration of existing institutions, and not by their destruction; by warring against the passions by faith and science.

Nicholas took part in the Council of Basle, of disastrous renown, in the reign of Eugenius IV (1431). He was then Dean of St. Florian's at Coblenz, and was called to the Council by the president, Julian Cesarini. On his side was John of Torquemada, who distinguished himself by his eloquence in the defence of the rights and prerogatives of the Papacy.* These three men soon abandoned all idea of effecting a reform in the Church by means of this Council; but making one more effort to prevent the schism, Cusanus and Torquemada went to Mayence, 1439, and later, in 1446, to the Diet at Frankfort, in order to make terms with the Opposition. Thanks to these efforts, which were seconded by Æneas Silvius Piccolomini (formerly a defender of the Council of Basle), by Sarhano, Bishop of Bologna, and by Carvajal (who later on

* See Lederer, "Torquemada," pp. 25 *seq.*, 123 *seq.*

played an important part during the Pontificate of Hadrian VI.)—thanks to the united efforts of these men an agreement was concluded, the result of which was that Sarhano in a short time ascended the Papal throne, taking the name of Nicholas, and was recognized by all parties as the legitimate Pope.

Nicholas Cusanus, renowned as a reformer and peacemaker, was no less remarkable as a man of science. Living a hundred years before Copernicus, he attributed the movement of rotation and progression to the earth. He was among the greatest of the older "humanists" in the real signification of the word, and was a worthy disciple of the "Brethren of Common Life," whom we shall refer to later on. He died in the year 1466, and was called by Trithemius "the angel of light and peace." This is the man chosen by Dr. Janssen as the type of this period.

Our author goes on to show that printing favoured the cause of Cusanus, and of the true Reformation. The clergy utilized on all sides the new invention to spread the Word of God and good reading. Some printers received patents of nobility; monastic printing-presses rose as by magic, and in less than fifty years all the large towns in Europe possessed printing machines. London and Oxford had some by 1477, and as early as 1475 Rome had twenty. In 1500 one hundred editions of the "Vulgate" had been printed. Most convents possessed copies of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, and by the time Luther appeared thousands of them were scattered throughout Germany. The "Imitation of Christ" was printed fifty-nine times before the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Catalogues were now drawn up of all the different works in type. The new printing-presses brought to light ancient national poems, all kinds of popular tales, popular treatises on medicine, rhymed versions of the Bible, &c. &c. Dr. Janssen observes that the fruits of the new invention were evidently offered not only to persons of fortune, but to the mass of the people. One of the most famous centres of printing was the town of Nuremberg, which sent forth works to all parts of Europe. In 1500 it had a depôt at Paris, and the eagerness to obtain copies of the classical authors was such that the arrival of every fresh waggon-load of books witnessed a hand-to-hand struggle for their possession.

In the next chapter Dr. Janssen describes the state of the elementary schools and of religious knowledge. This is no less interesting or appropriate to the author's plan, which is to give us a picture of the social and religious life of the people rather than a narrative of their exploits in the battle-field or of their seditious revolts; these last are sufficiently referred to for their influence and pernicious results to become apparent. We still

possess some school-books belonging to this period, which give us some idea of the state of education—reading-books, catechisms in Low German, “Mirrors of the Soul.” Other books, containing rules for good behaviour and the art of living, are no less characteristic of the times. To those named by the author we would add a book of Lambertus Goetman,* entitled, “The Mirror for Young Men” (“*Spyegel der Jonghers*”), published in 1488 in Flemish; then the “Mirror for Youth” (“*Spyegel der Joucheyt*”).†

A proof of the great esteem in which schoolmasters were held is that, according to Dr. Janssen’s computation, the salaries they received were relatively higher than what are given in these days. To impute to this period neglect of elementary education is, therefore, a mistake. There was no lack of means whereby the lower classes could obtain primary teaching, but ignorance prevailed often amongst the higher classes, who devoted their lives, many of them, to hunting and warfare.

The same may be said with respect to religious teaching, sermons, the study of the Bible, &c. Up to the present time certain writers have considered Luther as the “revealer” of the Holy Scriptures to a senseless world. A celebrated artist, the late Herr Kaulbach, of Munich, has, in a picture on the landing of the Museum staircase at Berlin, represented Luther standing on a pedestal, surrounded by the eminent men of the Middle Ages. He is holding the Bible on high in the attitude of a prophet announcing a new era to the world, in the discovery of the Word of Jesus Christ. We shall see more clearly later on what became of this Divine Word.

Concerning the sermons of the fifteenth century, Dr. Janssen and the Abbé Dacheux have met on the same ground. They each give us a series of proofs showing the importance attached to preaching by clergy and laity. The Abbé Dacheux names some Alsatian writers whose discourses have come down to us—Creutzer, Ulrich Surgant, Oiglin, Sattler, Wildegk, and many others (p. 5, &c.). Not to be present at the Sunday sermon was looked upon as a real sin. Priests who neglected to instruct their flocks in the Holy Scriptures were threatened with excommunication (p. 30). The number of preachers at Nuremberg, for example, was quite proverbial, and we may boldly conclude, writes Hipler, the author of “*Christliche Lehre*” (“Christian

* On this author may be consulted: Buddingh, “*Geschiedenis van het onderwys en de opweding*” (“History of Teaching and of Education”), Gravenhage, 1843. Also Schotel, “*Nederlandsche Volks Boeker*” (“Dutch Popular Books”). Haarlem: 1873, II., 219.

† See an extract from this work: P. Alberdingk Thijm, “*Spiegel van Nederlandsche Letteren*” (“Mirror of Flemish Literature”), II., p. 74, &c.

Teaching"), that in Prussia preaching was more frequent before than after Luther's time. It may even be calculated that, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, forty thousand copies of the sermons of some preachers had been distributed. Catechetical writings were not less numerous; and it is absurd to state that false ideas, say of the doctrine of indulgences, were held by the people because of their lack of instruction (p. 41). Our author here takes occasion to notice the remarkable work of J. Geffken,* "*Der Bildercatechismus des 15 Jahrhunderts und die catechetischen Hauptstücke in dieser Zeit bis auf Luther*," Leipzig, 1855 (Picture Catechisms, with explanatory chapters, from this time till Luther). Lastly, we will mention, as works of instruction, the so-called "*Plenaria*," or collections of Epistles and Gospels, with explanations and reflections.

Professor Alzog published at Freiburg, in 1874, a bibliographical pamphlet on this subject, and since then every year brings to light fresh discoveries of "*Plenaria*."† To these we might add the Flemish and Dutch editions—*e.g.*, one of Peter Van Os, Zwolle, 1488, a "*Plenarium of the Canons Regular of Schoonhoven*," 1505; another published by Vorsterman: Antwerp, 1591, &c.

Our author goes on to relate how education was greatly influenced by the schools of the Confraternity of Gerard Groete (Bruders van het gemeine leven, *Fratres vitæ communis*), Brothers of Common Life, natives of the Netherlands, where they had spread, especially in the north. They soon extended over a great portion of Germany.‡ Patronized by Eugenius IV., Pius II., Sixtus IV., many great humanists came forth from their schools,§ and Nicholas Cusanus was, as we have already remarked, one of their disciples.

The propagators of the study of the Humanities became, some of them, the instigators of the Reformation. Dr. Janssen, however, would not wish them to be all ranked alike. He proves

* Wackernagel, "*Kleinere Schriften*," i. 345, may be consulted on the custom in Italy of illustrating the sermon by pictures shown from the pulpit. See also, R. Cruel, "*Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*" ("*History of Preaching in Germany during the Middle Ages*"). Desmold. 15s.

† See "*Historisch-politische Blätter*" of MM. Jörg & Binder of Munich of the year 1875.

‡ Dacheux, p. 342.

§ Consult on this subject: 1st, Delprat, "*Verhandeling over de Broederschap van G. Groete*" (Treatise on the Confraternity of G. G.), Arnhem, 1846, or the German translation of Monike. 2nd, Gerard de Grootte a precursor (?) of the Reformation in the fourteenth century from unpublished documents by G. Bonet. Maury: Paris, 1878. See likewise Dacheux, p. 441.

with much acumen (and this is one of the characteristic features of his work) that the first humanists were far from foreseeing that their successors in the sixteenth century would abuse the study of pagan civilization to make war on Christian doctrines. He makes, therefore, a distinction, and divides the History of the Humanists from 1450 to 1550 into two periods. To the first belong Cusanus (p. 13) and the celebrated Rudolph Agricola, a native of Laffo, near Gröningen, in Holland, one of the founders of the study of the classics in Germany, but also a fervent Catholic.

Dr. Janssen names a series of learned men in Westphalia of the same stamp as Agricola, who obtained distinction by founding or organizing schools, the strict discipline of which would in these days seem little in harmony with the "Humanities." This picturesque sketch of the organization of the schools of that period is most interesting at the present day when a special study is made of school discipline and the use of the ferule.* In connection with Agricola we must not omit to mention James Wimpheling, of Schlettsbade, in Alsatia, that famous representative of sound learning, who received the title of "Teacher of Germany" (*Erzieher Deutschlands*). He was educated in the far-famed school of his native town in company with John Geiler of Kaisersberg, John of Dalberg, and some seven or eight hundred other scholars (p. 64; Dacheux, p. 443).

The sixteen universities of Germany,† four of which had just been founded, were no less well attended. Men of all ages and of all ranks were to be found there. The young prince sat by the side of the aged priest. The clergy were most numerously represented. The professors at Vienna numbered almost as many as they do now (p. 78). We will here note the name of the Carthusian monk, Werner Rolewinck, who for virtue and learning was a shining light at Cologne. He has left us a series of theological works, as also a sketch of the "History of the World," which ran through thirty editions in the space of eighteen years. This history was translated into French, and printed in Spain. Though not formally attached to the university at Cologne he used to give public lectures there, at which

* See, especially, the books mentioned by Dr. Janssen, p. 63, "Schulleben" (School-life), and p. 293, "Beten und Arbeiten" (Prayer and Work). To these I would add: Van Berkel, "Ein Hollandsch dorp" (A Dutch Village); in the Review, "Dietsche Warandi" revised by J. A. Alberdingx Thijm, i. 312; and the article, "Ein Schoolmeester" (A Schoolmaster), by the editor, in the same collection ii. 52, with illustrations; Schotel, "Vaderlandsche volksboeken" (Popular National Books, i. 199, &c.).

† Europe counted forty-six universities at this period.

the professors themselves were wont to attend. Of still greater fame was John Reuchlin as professor of Latin and Greek at Basle and Heidelberg. At his side shone the illustrious John of Dalberg (later on bishop) and a host of learned men skilled in Eastern lore, especially in the study of Hebrew, amongst whom we will only mention the celebrated John Trithemius, Abbot of Sponheim, near Kreuznach (born 1462, at Tritheim, on the Moselle), to whom flocked the youth and men of learning from all the neighbouring States. Trithemius was in correspondence with the most famous theologians, mathematicians, lawyers and poets of his time. He was esteemed alike for his learning, great virtue, and excellent social qualities. Together with John Geiler and Cusanus he may be styled a precursor of the Reformation in the same sense as all those may be designated who gave themselves up to the work of reorganizing certain ecclesiastical institutions or the rectifying of abuses. Trithemius was a zealous reformer of Benedictine monasteries. With views as practical as they were enlightened he recommended the method of study of S. Thomas Aquinas as the most suitable for young students. He has bequeathed us a general and scientific literary history of the sacred authors—a work which stands alone and is of great scholastic value. At the instigation of John Geiler he also wrote a remarkable “History of Germany” (“*Epitome rerum Germanicarum*”).*

Our author sketches for us Ulrich Zasius, the celebrated lawyer, Gregory Reisch, the mathematician, Heinlin of Stein, preacher at the Cathedral of Basle, Regio Montanus, the astronomer, and many others, representatives of an encyclopædia of science. A few of such names would be quite sufficient to prove the thesis of Dr. Janssen, that the fifteenth century, in spite of its gloomy side and of the moral degradation of the universities† was far from being a period of scientific decay.

All these men were humanists of the right sort. The young humanists of the beginning of the sixteenth century held quite opposite views; they made war on the Church and on the Empire in the name of liberty, and of pure taste for the literature of pagan antiquity.‡ But they had no inclination to side with Luther. Proud of their acquired knowledge they would not accept the decree that faith alone sufficed for salvation, and that philosophy was the work of Satan—tenets promulgated by Luther.

Our author now reviews the state of the Fine Arts. Paul Giovio, the biographer of Hadrian VI., with many other Italians, declared that Germany surpassed their own country in the matter

* Dacheux, p. 432.

† Höfler, p. 17, *seq.*

‡ See Pastor, p. 125.

of architecture (p. 139). Dr. Janssen gives us an account of the painting, sculpture, gold and iron work, embroidery and engraving, as also of the principal representatives of these divers arts.

The name of Hans Memling, the celebrated painter, gives us occasion to remark that, whereas Dr. Janssen supposes him to have been born at Memline, a village near Aschaffembourg in Bavaria (p. 168), Mr. James Weale, an English archæologist, believes that he was born in the Dutch province of Gueldres, and that his parents came from Medemblick in Holland. Among the celebrated artists of this period the names of Albert Durer and Holbein are, of course, not forgotten. Our author does not fail to direct our attention to certain humorous tendencies in the modelling art of the Middle Ages; he remarks truly that "it is only in ages of lively faith, of deep interior life, and of strong will-power that real humour is developed."

Referring to the different manners and customs of the people—dances, games, costumes, head-gear—our author describes their variety, picturesqueness, and charm. Further on, in the chapters on industrial life, commerce, and finance (pp. 343–370), he notices the excessive luxury that prevailed in dress, as well among the working-classes as among the citizens, insomuch that various sumptuary laws were passed at the Diets of the Empire—*e.g.*, against the use of gold and costly stuffs. Geiler of Kaisersberg used to inveigh against this extreme luxury and lack of modesty in dress; he devotes a long chapter to this subject in his "*Navis Fatuorum*."*

Dr. Janssen compares the music of this period to the architecture of the same time. This is a true comparison as regards the compositions of some of the musicians, whose complicated productions recall the exaggerated style, overcharged with ornamentation, of the fifteenth century—as, for example, Ockenheim; but the simplicity, freshness, and tenderness of the popular songs of the fifteenth century resemble more nearly the less affected architecture of the thirteenth century, or else the Roman style with its grandly simple lines. Gothic architecture was in its decline in the fifteenth century, whilst music as an art was being further developed and perfected.

Our author does not forget to notice such general literature of this time as popular prose works and chronicles, books of travels, &c. He commends specially the sacred and profane dramas, and describes the play called "*Antichrist*." This piece, which has been studied with much interest in these days, represents all the vicissitudes and dangers of a monarch's position, and the quick

* See Dacheux, p. 213.

growth of evil passions in one destined to reign. The wicked spirit is there represented under the name of Antichrist, and chooses for his victim the Emperor of Germany. The end of the play shows us the last-mentioned personage struck with lightning at the very moment he is intending to display all his magnificence.

Dr. Janssen calls attention to the humorous features of the theatrical representations. All the droll parts were given to the devil, and therefore it often happened that the principal rôle in the piece fell to his share; whole acts were played throughout by him and his companions. In France this was called "*diablerie*" (*devilry*).

To the authors named by Dr. Janssen who have studied this subject, we might add the late Abbé Lindemann, Rector of Niederkruchten, on the Dutch frontier (author of an extract in German, from the Abbé Dacheux's monograph on John Geiler), who in his "*History of German Literature*" gives a clear and rather complete sketch of dramatic art in the Middle Ages.*

Dr. Janssen concludes this chapter by a glance at the characteristic work of Sebastian Brandt, called "*Narren Schiff*" (The Ship of Fools), a humorous satire, in which the author lashes every abuse of the age, and persons of every rank who countenanced them. He was John Geiler's favourite author; they were contemporaries, and worked for the same end by different means—Geiler preached and Brandt wrote. The Abbé Dacheux has done well to give a long extract from this work at the end of his monograph. We see therein how two reformers expose and scourge the same social vices; the contempt for holy things, for religious customs, for Indulgences; the habit of frivolous swearing, pluralism in church benefices, every kind of profanity, deceit, adultery, &c., &c.†

Lastly, in the third and fourth books of the first volume, Dr. Janssen sketches the economic, judicial and political state of Germany at the end of the Middle Ages: 1st, agriculture, industry, commerce, and finance; 2nd, the position of Germany

* We would call the attention of our English readers to the "*Geschichte des Drama*" of B. Klein, an extensive work, in the twelfth and thirteenth vols. of which is given the history of the English Theatre. These might with advantage be worked up in an English form rather than translated. The above work, still unfinished, does not at present comprise the history of German Drama.

† Sebastian Brandt also wrote a "*Lives of the Saints*," only four copies of which are known to be extant. One of these is in the private library of the Abbé F. X. Krauss, professor of Church History at the University of Freiburg im Brisgau. It is a quarto volume. These words are written on the last page: "*Zu eren der wirdige Muter Gotes Beschlus dises Wercks Sebastian Brandt.*"

in its relations with other countries, its constitution, and laws, German and Roman.

The rights of the territorial lords as regards their tenants were very complicated at the end of the Middle Ages; but speaking generally the privileges of the holders of fiefs and of land had not been lessened, and the possession of the greater portion of the land lay with the vassals instead of with their lords, who seemed only to have a claim on service and contributions. These holdings had assumed the character of independent possessions. It is generally asserted that the War of the Peasants, which we shall speak of later on, was caused by the intolerable oppression of the tillers of the soil. We do not wish to deny that there were exceptional instances of this kind, but it has been proved that the general features of the agricultural class in the fifteenth century were quite patriarchal in character, and gave no pretext for revolt. It was the religious revolution, and the discontent excited by the preachers of (so-called) liberty, that made the greater portion of the people rise in rebellion.

The author reviews agricultural life and occupations, the relative value of country produce, and of the commerce and industries of the town. He compares commercial articles with provisions. A pound of saffron, for example, was worth as much as a cart-horse; a fat ox was cheaper than a velvet cloak of the most ordinary quality; a pound of sugar cost more than twice as much as a sucking-pig.

Then follows an account of the cultivation of gardens and wine, the home lives of the peasants, and their wages. An ordinary working man could earn in a week the value of a sheep and a pair of shoes; and in twenty-four days he could earn a large measure of rye, twenty-five stock-fish, a load of wood, and three ells of cloth. Was he to be pitied?

Then comes a sketch of industrial pursuits, of the state of the clubs and guilds of the artisans, their customs and rights, their assemblies—e.g., the "Tailors' Congress" at Oppenheim, in Frankfort-on-Maine—the produce of their handicrafts, their *chef-d'œuvres*; the commerce and history of the Hanse,* the centre of European commerce—which had reached its apogee in the fifteenth century. A thousand curious and interesting details but little known are here noted down—for instance, the adulteration of food and workmen's strikes. In a word, a picture of the people as perfect and finished as one of those of the

* Here the author would have us remark the etymology of the expression pound sterling, which means simply, pound easterling. In England the merchants of the Hanse were called "easterlings" (orientals). The current coin in England was for a long time Hanseatic money.

old masters, mentioned in the first part of the volume, is here put before us.

Our author does not forget to disclose the dark side of the period; the increase of riches and of life-comforts, financial speculations and usury; the taking advantage of small traders by wealthy merchants, and the discredit brought on commerce thereby; the profligacy, apparent in dress, against which Diets legislated, and preachers protested in vain. Amongst the latter was Geiler of Kaisersberg, who followed in the lead of Sebastian Brandt, as related by Abbé Dacheux in his monograph (p. 213).

Lastly, in the fourth book our author discusses the influence exercised by the Roman law on the ancient customs and habits of the German people. He works out the opinion that the introduction of Roman law proved an obstacle to the justice sought by the towns or guilds, and that it gave them into the hands of the territorial princes.*

The principle of German as of canon law was that every proprietor should use his property according to justice and morality. This principle was opposed to usury and to the artificial raising of the prices of provisions. According to Roman law each individual has the liberty and right to consult his own interest regardless of the need of others. This fundamental idea is in direct opposition to the moral principle of Germanic law. Wimpfeling calls the Roman law a series of lying and sophistic artifices; and Trithemius designates it as a new slavery (p. 495).

The introduction of Roman law singularly encouraged the desire of gain, and lawyers were soon denounced as the worst interpreters of law and justice. A most characteristic sign of the aversion entertained by the people for the learned men of law is the fact that in several agreements and compromises belonging to the second half of the fifteenth century, we find the several parties consenting that in case of any differences arising between them, or of any errors being discovered in the agreement, they would employ neither a doctor, licentiate, nor master in law to decide the question; "for these," said they, "seek for and create defects where none exist."

All the burghers thought alike; contemporary writers tell us that the lawyers were considered a greater evil than the "Free Lances," these last only taking possession of material property, and not interfering with men's souls.

It was only princes who, for reasons of absolutism, favoured the introduction of the Roman law, yet were they warned that

* Compare the opinion of Wimpfeling. Janssen, i. p. 489.

this legal chaos would some day lead to revolution. ("Chaos sanctionum humanarum; perplexitas veterum et novorum jurium.")*

After a short political sketch of the German monarchy of the Middle Ages, of the importance of imperial free towns (Reichstädte), &c., our author reverts to the reforms proposed by Nicholas Cusanus mentioned above. He relates the efforts of Nicholas to divide the Empire into twelve circles, each to have its imperial tribunal, composed of an ecclesiastic, a nobleman, and a burgher. Cusanus recommended the creation of a standing army, in order to strengthen the imperial power, and to be a safeguard against foreign princes; but his efforts were in vain, and the imperial authority declined, to the great detriment of the realm, whilst the power of the feudal princes increased (p. 466). This proved one of the great evils of the succeeding century.† The representatives of towns lost their influence, and the towns became dependent on the territorial lords. This was the case in the Mark of Brandenburg.

By the introduction of Roman law even legal science lost its importance. The new study introduced into the universities a petty, wrangling spirit, which was condemned by the most learned men of the time—a Reuchlin, Wimpfeling, and others (p. 477). A storm of satire fell upon the new organization, but in vain; the ambition of emperor and prince forbade any continuous opposition. Absolutism in Germany was too well favoured by the new law.

Francis I., King of France, wished meanwhile to become an absolute sovereign in his realm, and to add imperialism to royalty. He assumed the imperial insignia before setting out for Italy and the conquest of Naples. This was the signal for the endless warfare that filled all the reign of Charles V., and was the great cause of the unceasing anxiety of Hadrian VI.,‡ a Pope as holy as he was learned, who had ascended the Pontifical throne without the aid of nepotism, or of imperial favour.

Maximilian strove in vain to introduce measures of reform at the different Diets. "The representatives of the Empire," says Trithemius, "are quite accustomed now to yield up nothing to the Empire, and to ignore entirely their promises. Therefore, Maximilian no longer holds the power to defend justice, or to punish those who betray the peace of the State. We are continually in a state of civil war" (p. 860).

Maximilian was powerless to prevent the ancient glory of the Empire from being humbled; his efforts to reorganize the tribunals were badly supported; the princes did their utmost to pro-

* Wimpfeling, "Apologia," bk. 49. Janssen, i. p. 495.

† Höfler, p. 247, *seq.*

‡ Höfler, "Adrian VI." p. 92.

mote disturbances; the States constantly opposed his projects of reform, and refused their assistance in his war with the Republic of Venice, and for a proposed expedition against the Turks. Luther, protected out of policy by Frederic, the Elector of Saxony, was just peering above the horizon. Germany had to fight on all sides against the civil foes who were undermining her prosperity. Lastly, it is well known that after the death of Maximilian, when a new emperor had to be chosen, Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg, "the father of all cupidity," headed the party that wished to hand over the Empire to the King of France.

In spite of treachery, of the profligacy engendered by luxury, of the abuses among the clergy, and of the vices of the young humanists, which sapped the foundations of German prosperity, charitable institutions were ever increasing, religious life among the people did not lose in intensity, and by the efforts of Nicholas Cusanus provincial synods were held in many dioceses. Yet it is through the canons of these very synods that we learn the state of the Church in general, and the almost universal depravity. The learned Wimpfeling, an impartial spectator of events, exclaims: "I take God to witness that I know, in the Rhenish dioceses, an infinite number of ecclesiastics of solid learning, and of irreproachable life—prelates, canons, vicars—all pious, generous, and humble." But, unfortunately, these exceptions only confirm the rule, or, if not the rule, the examples contrary to those Wimpfeling refers to.

It was against this worldly spirit, which had penetrated into the higher classes, and, through them, had filtered through to the clergy, high and low, that John Geiler raised his voice. The laity,* by privileges which they well knew how to obtain, had gained an unheard-of influence in the nomination of rectors and vicars, whose moral dignity suffered not a little under the secular yoke. It is, then, the dark side of society, the very opposite view to Dr. Janssen's, which the life of Geiler unfolds before us. We will now see how the Abbé Dacheux treats the situation in the life and writings of his hero.

We have already noticed how the Abbé Dacheux and Dr. Janssen have met on the same ground in discussing certain facts in the history of the fifteenth century; for instance, the preaching, the style of sermon, the manner of teaching. With details of this kind the Abbé Dacheux opens his work on John Geiler, and his special aim is to make known the excellence of the preachers of Alsace, the field in which his reformer laboured most.

* See Lederer, "Johann v. Torquemada," Freiburg: Herder, 1879, pp. 40, 52; and Dacheux, "John Geiler," pp. 100, 156, 205, 209.

John Geiler was born at Schaffhausen, in Switzerland, in 1445; his father settled in Alsace, where he had obtained the post of registrar to the Council of Ammerswihir. After having sketched for us his first years of study, our author shows us how Geiler became famous by his preaching. He was chosen to fill the post of preacher at the University of Freiburg, but shortly afterwards the towns of Basle, Warzburg and Strassburg, disputed the honour of electing to their Cathedral pulpit a preacher of such eloquence, such immovable steadfastness, and such irreproachable life. Indeed, the office of preacher at Strassburg Cathedral was created for Geiler by Bishop Robert, of Bavaria, but the opposition of certain competitors succeeded in hindering the strictly official employment and adequate remuneration of Geiler till 1489.* Although he acknowledged all that Robert of Bavaria had done for him, Geiler would not allow his personal gratitude to obscure his judgment, or to interfere with the great aim he had proposed to himself. Almost his first remarkable sermon was the discourse at the funeral of Bishop Robert. With intent to depict the morals of the age, and to offer sage counsels to Robert's successor, he drew in striking words the principal faults of the deceased. In the form of a dialogue with the soul of the bishop he reproaches him with luxurious living, with haughtiness, with vanity, praising meanwhile his administration. He then draws the picture of a worthy bishop holding it up as an example to Albert of Bavaria, Robert's successor. This style of reproach and manner of counsel might be compared to that employed by the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Bernardino Carvajal, in a discourse addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff, Hadrian VI., at his presentation to the Sacred College at Rome, August 29, 1522. The bishop, desirous of reading a serious lesson to some of his colleagues—to the body of cardinals of the time of Leo X., and to the adherents of the schism under Julius II., rehearsed to the new Pontiff all the woes of the Church and the causes which produced them; the simony of the Popes; their want of intellect, knowledge and good will; their being elected to the Papal throne by men indolent and vicious. "Happily," said the bishop, "those times are now past and gone." Nevertheless he thought it expedient to propose to the newly-elected Pontiff several articles which as Pope he should observe: to protect liberty of voting; to introduce reforms according to the prescriptions of the holy canons: to embrace poverty, &c. &c.†

To come back to Geiler. His discourse was the first of a series preached against the abuses of the age.

The new bishop found in him a zealous auxiliary for the exe-

* Chap. xvii. p. 405.

† Höfler, "Pabst Adrian VI." p. 192.

cution of his projects of reform, and when he convoked a synod of the clergy in his diocese, Geiler was invited to pronounce the opening discourse. In it Geiler reproves the clergy for their rapacious and eager grasping at temporal goods; he compares them to leeches and to wild beasts. He speaks with no less contempt of the treasures of the rich, and especially of the use to which they put them; for instance, buying Church preferments for their sons. Truly the princes "lorded it over the prelates within their lands," as John of Torquemada said in a discourse preached before the Council of Basle against the decree which had for its aim to abolish Papal rights over ecclesiastical nominations ("decretum irritans")* Geiler reproaches the clergy with the abuse of canonical penances, with laxity in giving dispensations, with every description of iniquity committed in the towns, with the disorders allowed in the cathedrals, which were turned into public places where the people laughed and chattered and gave comic representations.

It cannot be denied that Geiler in some matters was too great a rigorist, and hence it often happened that those he reproved did not hear him very patiently.

One day in the year 1500 he inveighed in his sermon against the magistrate for not repressing with more energy the disorders and profanations committed by the burghers. The magistrate, meaning to call the preacher to order, sent him two delegates to demand an account of his bold words. Geiler answered by a pamphlet containing, in twenty-one articles, a scheme of administration afterwards famous, and disinterred by the author of this work.

In these articles Geiler reproaches the magistrate with the spoliation of the clergy and the poor in his opposition to certain bequests; with countenancing gambling, and allowing it to go on in the houses of the town councillors, who dedicated the revenue derived therefrom to the giving of banquets. Another article treats of the too great licence allowed in the frequenting of ale-houses, and of the non-observance of feast days. Geiler then complains that the gifts made to the Cathedral are taken for municipal requirements, and that the administration evinces the greatest parsimony in regard to the hospital, where the poor and other inmates are neglected and badly fed, though the institution is richer than the whole Cathedral Chapter. He complains of the excessive contributions exacted from the clergy, the encouragement given to murder by the non-punishment of

* See Lederer, "*Johann v. Torquemada*," p. 52. Compare Dacheux, pp. 100 and 156: "If there are bad priests it is because you (the princes) wish for such." Compare also pp. 205 and 209 on the "*Chevaliers Fanfarons*."

homicide, &c. &c. Lastly, he protests against the use of torture, as contrary to the laws of the Church.

From the beginning Geiler had the happiness of seeing that his preaching bore salutary fruit. The courage and boldness with which he poured forth his reproaches made the guilty tremble. The burghers were forbidden to hold profane assemblies in the Cathedral, the magistrates to hold court there, and the children to play at church services. A custom which prevailed on certain festivals—swearing by the members of God's body* was forbidden, and men were prohibited from entering the convents of women, &c. (p. 71). It cannot be denied that, influenced by him, religious life in convents received a new impulse (p. 196). It was through his intercession with the bishop and the Pope's Nuncio that condemned criminals who were really penitent were allowed to receive the Holy Eucharist, which hitherto had been denied them, and was again after the siege of Strassburg by Louis XIV. On the protest of Geiler priests were more generally admitted into the hospitals, the doors of which had hitherto been often closed upon them (p. 56).

May we not attribute the measures taken by Albert of Bavaria for the reformation of certain abuses, partly to the funeral discourse pronounced over his predecessor Robert? Is it not also evident that Geiler was invited to preach at the opening of the diocesan synod, on the understanding that he was to show up these same abuses among the clergy? This liberty of speech, of which he made full use, is a proof that the minds of men were drawn towards him; and this power of attraction was in itself a success. After the death of Albert of Bavaria Geiler pronounced an exhortation before the Chapter previous to the election of a successor; in this instance, we know not which to admire most, the courage of the preacher or the good-will of his audience, amongst which sat five bishops, the Marquess of Baden, the Prince of Bavaria, and many other territorial lords, relatives of the late bishop. These all listened to the preacher as to a prophet preaching penance, for Geiler, passing over in silence the virtues of the deceased prelate, inveighed against the sins and prevarications of church-dignitaries and secular princes. By the unanimous voice of the Chapter, of which the five bishops formed a part, the man whom Geiler had pointed out as the most worthy successor of Albert was elected. This was William, Count of Honstein, one of the youngest canons of the Cathedral (page 480). William had the courage and modesty to listen to the exhorta-

* This custom had spread even to the Netherlands. In the Mystery Plays the demons swore after that fashion, by the members of the Body of Jesus Christ. See, for example, the Miracle Play, called "*Le Sacrement de Nieuwervaert*," p. 84, published at Leuwarden (Suringar).

tions of Geiler, pronounced in a funeral discourse five days later, and addressed to every bishop given up to indolence, avarice, and luxury; the preacher concluded by entreating the newly-elected not to walk in the footsteps of such, but to meditate on the Holy Scriptures, to destroy in his heart all attachment to the world, and never to divert the riches of the Church from their right destination.

The Emperor Maximilian held Geiler in great esteem. He consulted him on matters of the highest importance, and asked him to draw up a kind of rule of conduct to guide him in the government of his subjects. Such was his respect for the eminent preacher that he would never allow him to remain uncovered in his presence.

Lastly, Geiler's contemporaries agreed that the conduct of the clergy showed signs of amendment. Wimpfeling, though severe in his judgment on the clergy, could discern a daily increase in the number of virtuous and learned ecclesiastics (pp. 136, 140, n. 167).

This improvement did not, it must be admitted, grow or deepen; neither did it spread throughout Germany. As soon as Luther appeared on the scene, the old passions of cupidity, indolence, indifference, added to unbelief, seemed to revive. Dr. Janssen attributes all this perverse influence to the so-called "Reformation," but unfortunately the germs of it existed long before. The learned and saintly Nausea, Bishop of Vienna, wrote, in 1527: "Who is to blame for all these abuses that have crept into the Church? It is we who are to blame—and all of us." He points to the clergy as the origin of grave errors. "That is why," said he, "the clergy should first be reformed."* Geiler, therefore, had not yet converted the world—no one imagined he had—and though his labours bore great fruit, his ardent zeal remained unsatisfied. He wished to see the diocese of Strassburg, at least, turn there and then from worldly ways, indecent dress, luxurious feasting; he insisted that the rich, either through avarice or the prodigality which impoverished them, should no longer seek Church emoluments in the shape of canonries for their sons; that the accumulation of Church benefices should cease; that dispensations of all kinds should be granted with more circumspection, &c. &c.

We have remarked that John Geiler went to extremes sometimes, but we must here note that his exaggeration lay rather in the form and in the expressions he used, than in his ideas themselves. Allowance should be made for his expressions, often strong and coarse, by taking into account the age in which they were used—the fifteenth, and the beginning of the sixteenth

* "De Reformanda Ecclesia," quoted by Herr Pastor, p. 287.

centuries, when a popular style of speech was used in the pulpit, as elsewhere, much more than it is now. The coarseness of Geiler's expressions cannot be compared with that found in the discussions between Luther* and his adversaries, and this fault of style continued till a much later period. We find, for instance, Charles IX. of Sweden, writing to Christian IV. of Denmark, to decline a duel, in language coarser than the coarsest used now. The last phrase of this letter runs: "This is our answer to thy coarse letter" ("auf deinen groben Brief"†). Yet modern times were close at hand!

Geiler's rigorism is apparent in his opposition to the dispensation given for the use of butter and eggs. He knew this custom already existed in the fourteenth century in the diocese of Cologne and Treves, but he opposed it because he saw it fostered the cupidity of the clergy (the "*turpis lucri cupiditas*" of Albert of Bavaria, p. 483).‡ The avarice of the bishops had unfortunately become proverbial. The saying: "*Es ist aber um gelt zu thun*" (it is a question of money) referred to every fine inflicted for disorders of all kinds, concubinage, &c., &c. Geiler considered this cupidity as one of the principal causes of decay in the Church. "It is the mother of dissolution," said he; "it leads to the accumulating of benefices, and to all those intrigues for misleading the Pope, from whom these exemptions and ecclesiastical fines proceed. By the sale of benefices the most learned and worthy priests, who had spent twenty years in teaching theology, were thrust aside to make way for candidates whose nomination was more lucrative.§

Geiler, however, was sometimes too severe in his strictures on this and other points. For instance, when he reproaches the Papacy with always demanding supplies to fit out expeditions against the Turks. Even the Abbé Dacheux acknowledges this (p. 249), and goes on to state some facts which prove how much the Popes did, from Calixtus III. (1455) to Alexander VI., who died in 1503, to promote the war against the Osmanli."¶ In 1481 it was feared in Rome that the city itself would before long be taken by the Turks.¶ Janssen and Höfler both insist upon the exertions made by the Popes against the Infidels.

* See and compare Höfler, p. 261; and Luther's "Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians," p. 377.

† See Gfröver, "Gustav Adolph," b. i. ch. i. p. 39, n., quoted by Holberg, "Dänische Reichshistorie," ii. 661.

‡ In his work, "*Peregrinetti*," Geiler speaks with more moderation about fasting. Dacheux, pp. 255, 290.

§ Compare Wimpfeling, quoted p. 122, n. 2.

¶ Compare Lederer, p. 268.

¶ Dacheux, p. 294, n.

The former cites (i. 555, n.) a work written by Hegewisch, a Protestant, and professor at the University of Kiel, towards the end of the eighteenth century, who, in his "History of the Emperor Maximilian," brought to light the efforts made by the Popes to organize a war against the Turks who threatened the German Empire. These efforts of the Roman Pontiffs were, as a rule, rendered futile by the indifference of the princes; for instance, those made by Pius II., aided by Cardinal Torquemada.* Herr Höfler in his turn gives undeniable proofs of the labours and anxieties of Hadrian VI. (p. 485) caused by the advance of the Turkish army, which advance Francis I. contemplated with satisfaction.

To return to our "Reformer." Geiler attributed the prohibition against nuns reserving some small portion of their fortune on entering a convent to the cupidity of certain authorities. The introduction of Roman law, which helped considerably to change the face of Germany, he considered, and with greater truth, to be a stimulus to cupidity. Many young men threw up their theological studies thinking to find in the law a more direct road to fortune, or else they took service at Rome, then looked upon as the California of the idle (p. 116).

We should exceed the limits of this Article were we to try to indicate all the interesting points of the Abbé Dacheux's work. It has already been reviewed by the critics of Germany, France, and other countries, who have noticed the striking features of a work which is a study of the innermost life and personal history of Geiler, rather than an account of the general movement of the period. In such a manner should we have liked to enter into Geiler's relations with his friends, especially with the Schott family—a real picture, given in the thirteenth to sixteenth chapters.

Fault has been found with the author for giving too many details of general history which had but small connection with Geiler himself. We are not of this opinion, for the Abbé Dacheux, in connecting the events of Geiler's life with the history of his age, only makes his sketch more attractive, and, indeed, more useful to our purpose, which is to give here an account, not of the advance made in the biographical details of this period, but of the progress made in discoveries relating to history taken as a whole, and of the coalescing causes productive of certain events. As is truly remarked by Dr. Janssen, the sermons of John Geiler are a real mine of knowledge, wherein to learn the popular life of that period (I. 263). One chapter might have been omitted by the author without breaking the harmony of his work; we

* Lederer.

refer to chapter XIV., the "History of the Convent of Klingenthal," which seems rather superfluous.

We will conclude this review by congratulating the Abbé Dacheux on the subject he has chosen, on the conscientiousness and perspicacity with which he has treated it, and on his style. We would also commend the typographical excellence of the work and its price. We would wish to see it translated into English. Historical truth would thereby be the gainer. John Geiler died in 1510, at the moment Luther was beginning to preach a reform very different to the one Geiler had longed for. We shall next pass on to the events which took place at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

P. ALBERDINGX THIJM.

ART. V.—THE REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The New Testament, translated out of the Greek: being the Version set forth, A.D. 1611, compared with the most Ancient Authorities and Revised, A.D. 1881.* Oxford University Press. 1881.
2. H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. *The Greek Testament, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version.* Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1881.
3. *Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament.* By C. J. ELLICOTT, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: Longmans. 1870.
4. *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament.* By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D. London: Macmillan. 1872.
5. *Biblical Revision: its Necessity and Purpose.* By MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN REVISION COMMITTEE. London: Sunday School Union.
6. *Companion to the Revised Version of the English New Testament.* By ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D. London: Cassell, Petter & Co.
7. *Variorum Teacher's Bible.* London: Queen's Printers. 1880.

THE English Bible has been likened to one of our old Cathedrals, not only in the beauty and majesty of its outlines, but also in the fact that it was originally Catholic. As in a much restored Cathedral, it is not easy to say what is old and what is new, how much belonged to Catholic times or how

much has been altered since; so it is with the oft-revised English Bible. Professor Blunt, in his "Plain Account," says that the foundation was certainly Catholic, being based on some version older than that of Wycliffe. Here, of course, he is at variance with most modern Protestant critics, who do not care to look back further than Tyndale. But he has Sir Thomas More to support him, and also the express statements of Cranmer and Fox, "who lived three hundred years nearer to the time they wrote of, were acute men, and recorded facts within their own knowledge." Had the Reformers spared the University and Monastic Libraries, we should have more evidence on the point. Again, it may be held that King James's Version is only the "Great Bible" twice revised; and that was Catholic, at least in its fourth edition, that of 1541, which was "oversene and perused at the commandment of the kinges hyghnes, by the right reverende father in God Cuthbert (Tunstall) bysshop of Duresme and Nicholas (Heath) bysshop of Rochester." The Great Bible was published when England was still Catholic; it was approved by Catholic bishops, who assured the King that it supported no heresy, and it found a home in the Catholic Churches of England when Mass was still offered at their altars. This Bible was revised by the Elizabethan bishops in 1568, and, in 1611, after a more lengthened revision, it appeared again in the world as King James's "Authorized Version," and was passed off as a New Translation. Nor did people suspect how much even this last revision was due to Catholic influences. There is little doubt that the complaints of Catholics about corrupt translations, expressed by Dr. Gregory Martin in his "Discoverie of Manifold Corruptions," combined with the King's hatred of the Genevan Bible and its notes suggestive of tyrannicide to bring about the revision. And in that revision King James's revisers were more largely influenced by the Rheims translation than they cared to own. Dr. Moulton, in his "History of the English Bible," says, "that the Rhemish Testament has left its mark on every page of the work" (p. 207). The Preface to the New Revision of 1881 acknowledges that King James's Bible "shows evident traces of the influences of a Version not specified in the Rules, the Rhemish, made from the Latin Vulgate, but by scholars conversant with the Greek Original."

Catholics may therefore be said to have a deep vested interest in what concerns the English Bible. It is true that Father Faber called it one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country. Still the same might be said of the old cathedrals and parish churches. Besides, whatever affects the religious life of the nation must have an interest for Catholics, a mournful

interest though it may be. Cardinal Newman, in his "Grammar of Assent," says:

Bible Religion is both the recognized title and the best description of English religion. It consists, not in rites or creeds, but mainly in having the Bible read in the Church, in the family, and in private. Now, I am far indeed from undervaluing that mere knowledge of Scripture which is imparted to the population thus promiscuously. At least, in England, it has to a certain point made up for great and grievous losses in its Christianity. The reiteration again and again, in fixed course in the public service, of the words of inspired teachers under both Covenants, and that in grave majestic English, has in matter of fact been to our people a vast benefit. It has attuned their minds to religious thoughts; it has given them a high moral standard; it has served them in associating religion with compositions, which, even humanly considered, are among the most sublime and beautiful ever written; especially it has impressed upon them the series of Divine Providences in behalf of man from his creation to his end, and, above all, the words, deeds, and sacred sufferings of Him, in whom all the Providences of God centre (p. 56).

Therefore any genuine effort, honestly made, to purify the text-book of English religion from errors, and to make it more conformable to the Divine originals, must enlist the sympathy of Catholics. If Church restoration serves the cause of Catholic truth, may we not expect the same of Bible revision? History proves that the Catholic Church in England was injured in the estimation of the people, mainly by corrupt translations. The so-called Reformation was an heretical appeal from the Church to the Bible, but to the Bible as translated by heretics, and in their translation there was no Church to be found, but only "congregation," no bishops and priests, but only "overseers" and "elders." Popular Bible religion was first schooled in the Calvinistic Genevan Bible of 1560, with its anti-Catholic notes. What wonder if, as it grew up, it spoke the language of Puritanism, and called the Pope anti-Christ and the Catholic Church the Beast. As Elizabeth could tune her pulpits, so could heretics phrase their Bibles. They stole the Scriptures from the Church, and then the Church from the Scriptures. Had the Bible been honestly translated and fairly interpreted, little harm would have come of the appeal. The Scriptures would have borne testimony of the Church, as they do of her Divine Founder. As the works of God cannot contradict the words of God, so the Inspired Word cannot be at variance with the Living Voice of the Holy Spirit, in the Church of Christ.

In the long struggle for existence between the various translations, King James's Bible prevailed according to the law of natural selection; it was the survival of the fittest. But it was

not till Queen Anne's reign that it obtained so firm a place in the affection of the nation. Had the Long Parliament been a little longer, Anglican bishops at least would have been saved the trouble of further revision. Still it could hardly be denied that the Authorized Version was very imperfect. The greatest Hebrew scholar of his day said "he would rather be torn to pieces than impose such a version on the poor churches of England." Bishop Lowth showed how defective was the Old Testament, from the fact that it rested entirely on the Masoretic text. The infallibility of the vowel points invented by the Masora in the sixth century was then a cardinal point in the creed of those who rejected the Church's authority. And in the New Testament it is well known that the translators had before them only the imperfect text of Stephens and Beza. How empty, then, was the boast of Protestants that their Bible was better than the Catholic because it was a translation from the original Hebrew and Greek, whilst the Catholic version was simply from the Latin Vulgate! With their imperfect text they could hardly be said to have had the originals at all, and it is pretty certain that the Vulgate as a whole is the closest approximation to the original attainable either then or now. In point of fidelity, the essential matter in Scripture translation, the Douai Bible is as superior to King James's as it is inferior in its English. For, as Dr. Dodd says, "its translators thought it better to offend against the rules of grammar than to risk the sense of God's Word for the sake of a fine period." Dr. Moulton acknowledges that "the translation is literal and (as a rule, if not always) scrupulously faithful and exact. . . . Only minute study can do justice to its faithfulness, and to the care with which the translators executed their work."* Another defect in the Authorized Version is the want of grammatical precision. It mistakes tenses, ignores synonyms, and has no appreciation for article or participle. Here, again, the Rheims has the advantage, at least as concerns the Greek article. To quote Dr. Moulton again :

As the Latin language has no definite article, it might well be supposed that of all English versions the Rhemish would be the least accurate in this point of translation. The very reverse is actually the case. There are many instances (a comparatively hasty search has discovered more than forty) in which of all versions, from Tyndale's to the Authorized, inclusive, this alone is correct in regard to the article (p. 188).

Another defect of King James's Revision was the neglect of the principal of verbal identity. The Revisers of 1881 admit—

* "History of the English Bible," pp. 185-188.

That this would now be deemed hardly consistent with the requirements of faithful translation. They seem to have been guided by the feeling that their Version would secure for the words they used a lasting place in the language; and they express a fear lest they should "be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good English words," which, without this liberty on their part, would not have a place in the pages of the English Bible. Still it cannot be doubted that they carried this liberty too far, and that the studied avoidance of uniformity in the rendering of the same words, even when occurring in the same context, is one of the blemishes in their work.

But the most serious fault of all is that the Authorized Versions contains absolute errors. Thomas Ward, in 1737, gave a list of some in the columns of his "Errata." Many of these were corrected in the editions 1762 and 1769. Dr. Ellicott, in the Preface to the "Pastoral Epistles," says:

It is vain to cheat our souls with the thought that these errors are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there *are* misconceptions, there *are* obscurities, not, indeed, so many in number or so grave in character as some of the forward spirits of our day would persuade us; but there *are* misrepresentations of the language of the Holy Ghost, and that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to bow to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will, if they be true, most surely at the dread day of final account have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable Word of God.*

Considering that this is the candid confession of an Anglican Bishop, Protestants have set to work to revise their Bible none too soon.

Perhaps it may be not uninteresting to give one or two specimens of not very successful attempts at revision or improved translation which have been made from time to time. Dr. Eadie and Professor Plumptre give many examples. "The young lady is not dead," "A gentleman of splendid family, and opulent fortune had two sons," "We shall not pay the common debt of nature, but by a soft transition," &c. These are from "Harwood's Literal Translation of the New Testament," made, as the author claims, with "freedom, spirit and elegance!" The next is from a version which is the reverse of elegant. Describing the death of Judas, it says: "Falling prostrate, a violent internal spasm

* "Pastoral Epistles," p. xiii.

ensued, and all his viscera were emitted," "Blessed are you amongst women and blessed is your incipient offspring." Another enterprising reviser published the Gospels in a dramatic form. The great Franklin tried his hand at a new version of the Book of Job, and by his conspicuous failure rejoiced the soul of Mr. Matthew Arnold, who says :

I well remember how, after I first read it, I drew a deep breath of relief, and said to myself, "After all, there is a stretch of humanity beyond Franklin's victorious good sense."*

The Baptists made a translation of the New Testament, and St. John became "the immerser," and our Lord was made to say, "I have an immersion to undergo." In another version repentance was translated "change of mind," and thus the precept "do penance" was made very easy of fulfilment—"change your mind." The Unitarians brought out a translation which was very Arian. These attempts would have made all serious revision impossible, had not "The Five Clergymen," of whom Dr. Ellicott was one, showed that it was quite possible to combine more accurate rendering with due regard for the old version.

Convocation took up the matter seriously in 1870, but the two Provinces could not agree. The Convocation of Canterbury were eager for the work, but the Northern Assembly did not think it opportune. One dignitary thought that to revise the English Bible would be "like touching the Ark." Another right reverend prelate deprecated "sending our beloved Bible to the crucible to be melted down." A third thought they had better wait till the "Speaker's Commentary" was finished, which was like Cranmer's famous saying about the Bishop's Bible—that it would be ready "the day after Doomsday." Certainly there was good reason to hesitate before undertaking such a serious task as amending the English Bible, the pillar and ground of the popular creed. The estimate of probable change was high—possibly some 20,000 emendations in the New Testament alone, many of them affecting the text itself. Dr. Thirlwall spoke of favourite proof-texts disappearing from their present prominence in current homiletical teaching. Dr. Ellicott said that there "were passages not a few which revision would certainly relieve from much of their present servitude of misuse in religious controversy." Dr. Owen had said long before that Walton's various readings in his Polyglott would make men papists or atheists. And Lord Panmure had solemnly declared at a public meeting at Edinburgh "that the prospect of

* "Culture and Anarchy," p. 44.

a new version is fraught with the utmost danger to the Protestant liberties of this country, if not to the Protestant religion itself."

Undaunted by these terrors, the Convocation of Canterbury settled down to do the work by itself, the University Presses finding the money as the price of copyright. The work was to be done by its own members, but liberty was given "to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong." Two committees were to be formed, one for each Testament, and rules for guidance were drawn up. To make as few changes as possible; to go twice over the ground; changes to be settled by vote, the majority to have the text, the minority the margin. The rules were mainly copied from those given to the Revisers of 1611, except in the matter of voting. It must be confessed that "Gospel by ballot" is an essentially modern idea. About fifty Revisers were selected in England and thirty in America—Churchmen, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists. Cardinal Newman and Dr. Pusey were invited, but declined to attend. Convocation, regardless of Christian sentiment, also invited to their aid Mr. Vance Smith, a Unitarian, who may be a distinguished scholar, but is certainly no Christian, and they gave him a place, not in the Old Testament committee, but in the New, which was unpardonable. The Anglo-American "Septuagint," with a few spare men in case of accidents, was now complete—a somewhat heterogeneous body certainly, with doctrinal differences as wide as the Atlantic dividing them, but empowered by Convocation to revise the Gospel, and to settle the Bible of the future.

Now, it must be remembered that since the year 1611, a new science has been born into the world, called Textual Criticism—a science which professes to enable men of sufficient self-confidence to determine with absolute certainty, by the aid of a small number of MSS., hardly legible, what the text of the Scripture really is. This science, at least in the opinion of its professors, quite compensates for the loss of the inspired Autographs, and by its aid the textual critic has no difficulty in telling amidst thousands of various readings, what the sacred writer really wrote. This would be an unmixed blessing to the religious world, if textual critics could but agree one with another. That each critic should have his own theory of recension, and his own view of the age and genealogy of different MSS., is not to be wondered at. But that no two critics can agree upon a plain matter of fact is certainly surprising. To take an instance from the much-disputed reading of 1 Timothy iii. 16. If we ask what is the reading of one particular MS., the Codex Alexandrinus in the British Museum, one critic says it is "God," another says it is

"indisputably the relative pronoun." All turns upon the presence or absence of a faint line. One distinguished critic examines with a "*strong lens*" and says the disputed line is really the sagitta of an epsilon on the other side of the vellum. Another, equally distinguished, who says he has eyes like microscopes, saw two lines, one a little above the other.*

What, then, has textual criticism done for the New Testament? It has destroyed the old *Textus Receptus*, but it has failed to construct another in its place. Since the days of Griesbach every critic of any textual pretensions makes a text for himself. Lachmann, Scholz, Tregelles and Tischendorf have published their texts. Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hart have just published another, the result of twenty years' toil.

Here, then, lay the chief difficulty of the revision of the New Testament. King James's Revisers had an easy task—simply to translate the text that Pope Stephens, as Bentley calls him, had fixed for them. But the Revisers of 1881 had first to find the text and then make the translation. Like Nabuchodonosor's wise men, they were required first to find the dream and then make out the interpretation. If they have failed, the blame must rest not upon them, for they could hardly be expected to be all Daniels, but upon the Church which set them to such a task. To any one who knows what textual criticism is, how dubious in its methods, how revolutionary in its results, it is amazing that any Church calling itself Christian should hand over the Sacred Scriptures, the very title-deeds of its existence, to the chance voting of critics, who are scholars first and Christians afterwards, and some not Christians at all. That it should give to these men power over the Word of God, to bind and loose, to revise and excise, to put in and leave out, to form the text as well as to give the interpretation. Yet this has been done by that Church, which made it an article of its creed that other Churches had erred and that nothing was to be believed but what was found in Scripture and could be proved thereby!

After ten and a half years of discussing and voting in 407 sessions, the Anglo-American Septuagint have finished the first part of their work—the New Testament. The committee of the Old Testament will require three or four years more. King James's Bible occupied nearly three years. But then the New Revision has been gone over seven times and has twice crossed and recrossed the Atlantic. On the 17th of May the much-travelled, oft-revised version was published to the world, both the

* Scrivener's "*Textual Criticism*," p. 554; Ellicott's "*Pastoral Epistles*," p. 103.

English Translation and the Greek Text, as they read it. That day will be ever memorable in the calendar of the Church of England, but whether as a feast or a fast, time alone will show. Perhaps, as in the case of the Greek Septuagint, it may be both.

The Revisers claim for their work, by the mouth of their great oracle, Dr. Ellicott, the credit of "thoroughness, loyalty to the Authorized Versions, and due recognition of the best judgments of antiquity." That it has been thorough is proved by the number of emendations, which are considerably in excess of the estimate first given. These number about nine to every five verses in the Gospels, and fifteen to every five in the Epistles. In other words, there are some 20,000 corrections, fifty per cent. being textual. Considering they were bound by express rule "to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version," this is pretty thorough. What will the good people in England and Scotland think who believe in the verbal inspiration of the English Bible, looking upon it as the pure, authentic, and unadulterated Word of God? It seems to us that the revision is too thorough for the popular mind, and not thorough enough for the educated. The more advanced suggestions from the American committee, appended to the Revised Version prove this. By loyalty to the Authorized Version we presume Dr. Ellicott means that they have not spoilt its "grave majestic English," or broken the charm of "the music of its cadences" or marred the "felicities of its rhythm." Now this is just what they have done, and what they could not help doing with their minute verbal literalism. Still they need not have written bad grammar, as the author of "The Dean's English" shows that they have done. Deep study of the Greek grammar has perhaps made them forget their own. As to the claim about "a due recognition of the best judgments of antiquity," Dr. Ellicott admits that though "not equally patent it will rarely be looked for in vain." On the contrary, we think that it is conspicuous by its absence. Again, he claims that it is "no timid revision, without nerve enough to aim at comparative finality." A revision which leaves out some forty entire verses and makes twenty thousand changes cannot be charged with timidity. But "comparative finality" is another matter. It is an illusion to suppose that finality can be attained by petty compromises with rationalism. Now textual criticism is a tool belonging to rationalism. The Revisers have borrowed it to help them to revise their Bible. They have used the tool sparingly, but they have taught others to use it, who will be less gentle. With a Variorum Bible and good eyesight, even an ignorant man can revise his Bible for himself; and soon there will be no Bible to revise. In the first days of Protestantism private judgment

fixed what the Scripture meant; now textual criticism settles what Scripture says; and shortly "higher criticism" will reject text and meaning alike. What has happened in Germany will happen in England.

We have next to examine the New Version in detail to see how it will affect Catholic truth. In the first place, there are several important corrections and improved renderings. The Revisers have done an act of justice to Catholics by restoring the true reading of 1 Cor. xi. 27, "Whosoever shall eat the bread *or* drink the cup," &c., and thus removing a corruption which Dean Stanley owned was due "to theological fear or partiality." They have removed from their version the reproach of Calvinism by translating St. Paul correctly. Beza's well-known interpolation in Heb. x. 38, "any man," brought in to save righteous Calvinists from supposing they could ever fall away, has disappeared. But perhaps the most surprising change of all is John v. 39. It is no longer "Search the Scriptures," but "Ye search;" and thus Protestantism has lost the very cause of its being. It has also been robbed of its only proof of Bible inspiration by the correct rendering of 2 Tim. iii. 16, "Every Scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable," &c. The old translation appears in the margin, a minority of the translators apparently adhering to it. Marriage is no more a necessity for eternal salvation in all men. The Apostles have now power to "forgive" sins, and not simply to "remit" them. "Confess *therefore* your sins" is the new reading of James v. 16, and the banished particle has returned to bear witness against Protestant evasion. Some amends, too, have been made to Our Blessed Lady. She is declared by the Angel who spoke to St. Joseph to be "*the* Virgin" foretold by Isaias, and she is "endued with grace," at least in the margin. Why could they not have softened the apparent harshness of our Lord's word in John ii. 4, when, as Dr. Westcott owns, "in the original there is not the least tinge of reproof, but an address of courteous respect, even of tenderness?"

But there are several points to which we must take exception. For instance, to say in Phil. ii. 6, that Christ "counted it not a *prize* to be on an equality with God" is bad translation and worse divinity. They have spoilt St. Paul's description of charity by calling it "love," thus falling back into Tyndale's error, which Lord Bacon praised the Rheims translators for correcting. As they have sinned against Charity, so also have they wronged Faith by calling it "the assurance of things hoped for" (Heb. xi. 1). In the same Epistle they have translated the same word *ὑπόστασις* in three different ways, as substance, confidence, and assurance. In Our Lord's commission to St. Peter (John xxi. 17) they have chosen the weak word "tend" as the equivalent of

πολιτευε; yet in Matthew ii. 6, where the Prophet applies the same verb to Christ, they render it "be Shepherd over," and in the Apocalypse it is "*rule*." The same word Paraclete is rendered Comforter in St. John's Gospel, but Advocate in his Epistle. For fear lest they should countenance the Catholic doctrine of relative worship, the dying Jacob in Heb. xi. 21 is still left "*leaning* upon the top of his staff," and is made a hero of faith for so doing! It was expected that the Revisers, in deference to modern refinement, would get rid of hell and damnation, like the judge who was said to have dismissed hell with costs. Damnation and kindred words have gone, but hell still remains in the few passages where Gehenna stands in the original. A new word, "*Hades*," Pluto's Greek name, has been brought into our language to save the old word hell from overwork. The Rich Man is no longer in "*hell*" he is now "*in Hades*;" but he is still "*in torment*." So Hades must be Purgatory, and the Revisers have thus moved Dives into Purgatory, and Purgatory into the Gospel. Dives will not object; but what will Protestants say?

Nor have they been more happy in their treatment of the Lord's Prayer. St. Jerome's experience with the Psalms might have taught translators that it is not wise to alter an accustomed prayer for the sake of a slight gain in accuracy. People always resent interference with the form of words they have learnt from their childhood. The balance, if there is any, in favour of a masculine instead of the old neuter rendering is too slight to warrant the rendering "*Deliver us from the evil one*." The Syriac version supports the rendering, and so do some of the Greek Fathers. The article, Bishop Middleton says, is here quite impartial. The Latin bears either interpretation, and the Catholic Church in her explanation of the "*Our Father*" in the Tridentine Catechism gives both. The question about "*our daily bread*," whether it is to-day's or to-morrow's, is more difficult. There seems to have been some hard voting on the point. Dr. Lightfoot and his supporters were out-voted and driven into the margin to pray for "*bread for the coming day*." *ἐπιβιωτικός* is a word which occurs but once in the New Testament; it has a doubtful etymology and more than one meaning. The old Latin had *quotidianum*, but St. Jerome changed it into *supersubstantialem* in St. Matthew's version, whilst he left St. Luke's unchanged. St. Bernard forbade Heloise to adopt the former word, and Abelard wrote to defend her.

The Revisers have striven to remedy the ignorance of their predecessors in the matter of Greek synonyms and have thus brought out distinctions obliterated in the Authorized Version. The four living creatures of the Apocalypse are no longer "*beasts*."

Temple and sanctuary are distinguished. The compounds of κρίνειν are no longer mixed so confusedly. Devils are carefully marked off from demons; children from babes. "Be not children in mind; howbeit in malice be ye babes, but in mind be men" (1 Cor. xiv. 20). In this and a multitude of instances the Revisers have shown scholarship. But possibly the poverty of our language did not allow them to bring out the difference between φιλεῖν and ἀγαπᾶν; or between βάρος and φορτίον (Gal. vi. 2, 6). So St. Paul must needs go on giving contradictory advice.

We miss some of the oddities of the old version; still the new is not without some peculiarities to make up. The mariners in St. Paul's voyage do not "fetch a compass;" the Apostles no longer keep their "carriages" (Acts xxi. 15). "Old bottles" are changed into "wine skins," candles into lamps, the thieves have become "robbers," the birds of the air have lost their "nests" and now have only "lodging-places." David is no longer a time-server (Acts xiii. 36), but the Baptist's head is still in the "charger." "Banks" have at last found a place in the Gospel. The man who scandalizes, or rather "makes to stumble," a child will find it "profitable for him" to have "a millstone turned by an ass" hanged about his neck; at least so the margin puts it (Matt. xviii. 6). "The woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels; but the margin reads "over her head" (1 Cor. xi. 11). It will no longer be open to doubt about the sex of "Euodia and Syntyche, who are exhorted "to be of the same mind in the Lord," for it is expressly added "help *these* women" (Phil. iv. 2).

It was hardly perhaps in human nature to expect a committee made up for the most part of married clergymen to forego a text so dear to them as 1 Cor. ix. 5. Ἀδελφή is rightly rendered a "believer," but in their eyes γυνή could have no other meaning than wife. Yet Dr. Wordsworth might have taught them that ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα meant simply a Christian woman, and might have shown them by the testimony of Tertullian, whom he quotes, that St. Peter was the only Apostle who was married. Possibly, too, a correct translation might have been thought detrimental to Protestant Societies for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

Again, preachers will grieve to find that they have been robbed of a favourite text, and that Agrippa is neither "almost" nor "altogether a Christian." Total abstainers will learn that they are to "be no longer drinkers of water;" and vegetarians will be disgusted to find that their lentil pottage, so appetizing to the hungry Esau, is changed into "a morsel of meat."

The Revisers have thought good to make certain changes in the Apostolic College. They have discovered hitherto unus-

pected relationship between Judas the Traitor and the Apostle Simon the Zealot. In John vi. 71, Judas is called the "son of Simon Iscariot." On the other hand, they have deprived the Apostle St. Jude of the honour of being "the brother of James," and so of the authorship of the Epistle.

The American Revisers are like the disciples St. Paul found at Ephesus, who did not know that there was a Holy Ghost. They suggest that the word should everywhere be changed into Holy Spirit. This suggestion was not accepted, and was banished to the limbo of rejected American suggestions. But Mr. Vance Smith blames the English committee for their conduct, and says that "they have not shown that judicial freedom from theological bias which was certainly expected of them." The American Revisers are quite above reproach on this point. So great is their freedom from dogmatic prejudice that they suggested the removal of all mention of the sin of heresy—heresies in their eyes being only "factions." They desired also that the Apostles and Evangelists should drop their title of Saint, and be content to be called plain John, and Paul, and Thomas. This results, no doubt, from their democratic taste for strict equality, and their hatred of titles even in the Kingdom of Heaven. It is certainly surprising to find these gentlemen a little over-particular in the matter of St. Peter's scant attire when he jumped overboard. They wished to add a marginal note to the effect that St. Peter "had on his under-garment only." On another point also, not we think of any great importance, the American Revisers have thought it necessary to express dissent from their English brethren. And this in regard to the fate of the herd of swine, into which the devils entered and drove headlong into the lake. The English Revisers say they were "choked," but the American verdict is different; they would bring them in as "drowned." It will thus be seen that these gentlemen combine the greatest doctrinal breadth with most minute scrupulosity of detail. Seeing how ill their suggestions have been received by their English brethren, who are still under the yoke of antiquated conservatism, it is quite possible that next time they will revise their own Bible for themselves according to their own unfettered ideas.

In regard to proper names it seems to us that the Revisers have taken a most unwarrantable liberty with the language of the New Testament. They say "our general practice has been to follow the Greek form of names, except in the case of persons and places mentioned in the Old Testament: in this case we have followed the Hebrew" (Preface, p. xviii). In other words, they have thought themselves competent to teach Apostles and Evangelists how to spell proper names! St. Matthew wrote Aram and Salathiel, but he should have written, as the New

Version correctly puts, Ram and Shealtiel. St. Luke mistook Juda for Joda, and St. James seems not to have known that the right name of Elias was Elijah. Unless it should turn out that the Revisers were really inspired to correct the New Testament as well as the Universal Church, we think them guilty both of great presumption and a gross blunder. These modern scribes would make the Gospel yield to the Law, and the Church bow to the synagogue. They prefer the silly pedantry of a few wrong-headed Reformers of the sixteenth century to the practice of Christendom in every age. Are they ignorant of the fact that the inspired writers of the New Testament took their quotations as well as their proper names, not from the Hebrew, but from the Greek Septuagint? To be consistent, they should have corrected the quotations too; perhaps they may yet do so on further Revision.

Lastly, we come to the most serious point of all—viz., the passages the Revisers have thought proper to leave out altogether. So far it has been a question of translation and of names, but here the vital integrity of Sacred Scripture is affected. By the sole authority of textual criticism these men have dared to vote away some forty verses of the Inspired Word. The Eunuch's Baptismal Profession of Faith is gone; the Angel of the Pool of Bethesda has vanished; but the Angel of the Agony remains—till the next Revision. The Heavenly Witnesses have departed, and no marginal note mourns their loss. The last twelve verses of St. Mark are detached from the rest of the Gospel, as if ready for removal as soon as Dean Burgon dies. The account of the woman taken in adultery is placed in brackets, awaiting excision. Many other passages have a mark set against them in the margin to show that, like forest trees, they are shortly destined for the critic's axe. Who can tell when the destruction will cease? What have the offending verses done that textual critics should tear them from their home of centuries in the shrine of God's Temple? The sole offence of many is that the careless copyist of some old Uncial MS. skipped them over. Some, again, have been swallowed up by "the all-devouring monster Omoio-Teleuton"—the fatal tendency which possesses a drowsy or a hurried writer to mistake the ending of a verse further down for the similar ending of the verse he copied last. The Angel of Bethesda may have cured "the sick, the blind, the halt and the withered," but modern science has no need of his services, for it has proved, without identifying the site, that the spring was intermittent and the water chalybeate. But our intelligent critics forgot to get rid of the paralytic, whom the Lord cured, and as long as he remains in the text his words will convict

them of folly. To take another instance. In many places in the Gospels there is mention of "prayer and fasting." Here textual critics suspect that "an ascetic bias" has added the fasting; so they expunge it, and leave in prayer only. If an "ascetic bias" brought fasting in, it is clear that a bias the reverse of ascetic leaves it out. St. Luke's second-first Sabbath (vi. 1) puzzled the translators, so they reduced it to the rite of an ordinary Sabbath by omitting the perplexing word *δευτεροπρώτη*. Yet one of the fundamental rules of textual criticism, and they have only two or three, says, "*ardua lectio præstet proclivi.*" Perhaps the reading here was too "hard" for the translators, and so they changed the rule. We have no patience to discuss calmly their shameful treatment of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses." The Revisers have left out the whole verse in 1 John v. 7, 8, without one word of explanation. Surely no one but a textual critic could be capable of such a deed. Nor would any one critic have had the hardihood to do such a thing by himself. It required the corporate audacity of a Committee of Critics for the commission of such a sacrilege. But textual critics are like book-worms—devoid of light and conscience, following the blind instincts of their nature, they will make holes in the most sacred of books. The beauty, the harmony, and the poetry of the two verses would have melted the heart of any man who had a soul above parchment. Fathers have quoted them, martyrs died for them, saints preached them. The Church of the East made them her Profession of Faith; the Church of the West enshrined them in her Liturgy. What miserable excuses can these Revisers have for such a wanton outrage on Christian feeling? They cannot find the words in their oldest Greek MSS.! The oldest of them is younger than the Sacred Autographs by full three hundred years, and the best of them is full of omissions. Most of them are copies of copies; and in families of MSS., if the father sins by omission, all his children, whether uncial or cursive, must bear the loss. The textual critics of the seventeenth century left out the second half of the 23rd verse of the 2nd chapter of this very Epistle of John, because it was not found amongst the few MSS. which formed the slender stock-in-trade of Incipient Textual Criticism. Since then older and better MSS. have been added, containing the missing sentence; and the critics of the nineteenth century have been forced to restore to the Sacred Text what their fathers stole. Who knows but that another Tischendorf may arise, and find in some secluded monastery of the Nitrian Desert a MS. older than the Sinaitic, containing the "Heavenly Witnesses?" But true critics, who are not merely textual, know that there is a higher criterion of genuineness than MS. authority. There is what Griesbach

calls an "interna bonitas;" there is what Bengel calls an "adamantina cohærentia," which he says, speaking of this very passage, "compensate for the scarcity of MSS." But our enlightened Revisers contend that the passage is a gloss of St. Augustine's, which has slipped from the margin into the text, when nobody was looking. How, then, did Tertullian and St. Cyprian quote the words a century before? How is it that the Santa Croce "Speculum," which Cardinal Wiseman thought to be St. Augustine's own, gives the words three separate times as the words of Scripture? It is beyond dispute that the Old Latin Version, made in the first half of the second century, and revised by St. Jerome in the fourth, contained the words. Still, they persist, the Peshito Syriac omits them. So does it omit four entire Epistles, to say nothing of the Apocalypse. Yet St. Ephrem, who certainly knew what was in the Syriac Bible, quotes, or rather alludes to the words. But they say the Fathers did not make much use of the words against the Arians. There is many another handy verse, the genuineness of which no one doubts, though the Fathers never cited it. The Fathers were not always quoting Scripture with chapter and verse, like modern Bible-readers and tract-distributors. But here is a fact, worth more in point of evidence than a cart-load of quotations. In the year 483, at the height of the great Vandal persecutions, four hundred African bishops in synod assembled drew up a Confession of the Catholic Faith containing the disputed text. This Confession they presented to the Arian Hunneric, King of the Vandals. Many of them sealed their testimony in their blood. About fourteen hundred years later some two dozen Anglican prelates, aided by Methodist preachers, Baptist teachers, and one Unitarian, assembled in synod at Westminster to revise the New Testament, and without a semblance of persecution they yielded up to modern unbelief a verse which Catholic bishops held to the death against Arianism. These men are worse than the ancient Vandals, who only killed the bishops, but did not mutilate the text of Sacred Scripture. In this Socinian age the world could better spare a whole bench of Anglican bishops than one single verse of Holy Writ which bears witness to Christ's Divinity and the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. Well might Strauss ask the question in one of our English periodicals, "Are we Christians?" Well may M. Renau cross the water to lecture England on the origin of Christianity.

But these modern excisers have committed a blunder as well as a crime. They stealthily cut out the verse, but they have joined the pieces so clumsily that any one can detect the fraud. As the passage now stands in their version is without sense, though they foist in the word "agree" to smooth over the

difficulty. "The witness of God" in the following verse is meaningless without the Heavenly witnesses. Their new-made Greek text will make schoolboys wonder how the first Greek scholars of the day could have so forgotten their syntax as to try and make a masculine participle agree with three neuter nouns. The Article too, as Bishop Middleton foretold, will reproach them with a half measure, for they should either have kept both verses in or cut both out. Yet strange to say these Revisers have no shame, no remorse for what they have done. One of them likens what they have done to getting rid of a perjured witness! Another talks calmly of the Revisers being in Paradise, and this after they have dared to take away from the words of him who prophesied that God would take away such men's part from the tree of life and out of the Holy City.

Cardinal Franzelin concludes his masterly defence of the Three Heavenly Witnesses with a remark as true as it is sad. Protestants, he says, have given up the verse because they have first given up the doctrine it supports. St. Jerome says that after a certain council which left the word Homousion out of its Creed, the world awoke and shuddered to find itself Arian. On the 17th of May the English-speaking world awoke to find that its Revised Bible had banished the Heavenly Witnesses and put the devil in the Lord's Prayer. Protests loud and deep went forth against the insertion, against the omission none. It is well, then, that the Heavenly Witnesses should depart whence their testimony is no longer received. The Jews have a legend that shortly before the destruction of their Temple, the Shechinah departed from the Holy of Holies, and the Sacred Voices were heard saying, "Let us go hence." So perhaps it is to be with the English Bible, the Temple of Protestantism. The going forth of the Heavenly Witnesses is the sign of the beginning of the end. Lord Panmure's prediction may yet prove true—the New Version will be the death-knell of Protestantism. But one thing is certain, that, as in the centuries before the birth of Protestantism, so after it is dead and gone the Catholic Church will continue to read in her Bible and profess in her Creed that "there are Three who give testimony in Heaven and these Three are One."

We have spoken of the admissions, the peculiarities, and the omissions of the newly Revised Version. It only remains to express our deep anxiety as to its effect upon the religious mind of England and Scotland. It cannot but give a severe shock to those who have been brought up in the strictest sect of Protestantism. Their fundamental doctrine of verbal inspiration is undermined. The land of John Knox will mourn its dying Calvinism. The prophets of Bible religion will find no sure word from the Lord in the new Gospel. But assuredly the Broad Church

will widen their tents yet more, and rejoice in the liberty wherewith Textual Criticism has made them free. Already one of their great oracles, himself a Reviser, has declared that Inspiration "is not in a part but in the whole, not in a particular passage but in the general tendency and drift of the complete words." And he teaches a new way to convert the working-classes from their unbelief. "The real way," he says, "to reclaim them is for the Church frankly to admit that the documents on which they base their claims to attention are not to be accepted in blind obedience, but are to be tested and sifted and tried by all the methods that patience and learning can bring to bear." Then Heaven help the poor working man if his sole hope of salvation lies in the new Gospel of Textual Criticism! But what will those think who, outside the Catholic Church, still retain the old Catholic ideas about Church and Scripture? How bitter to them must be the sight of their Anglican Bishops sitting with Methodists, Baptists, and Unitarians to improve the English Bible according to modern ideas of Progressive Biblical Criticism! Who gave these men authority over the written Word of God? It was not Parliament, or Privy Council, but the Church of England acting through Convocation. To whom do they look for the necessary sanction and approval of their work, but to public opinion? One thing at least is certain, the Catholic Church will gain by the New Revision, both directly and indirectly. Directly, because old errors are removed from the translation; indirectly, because the "Bible-only" principle is proved to be false. It is now at length too evident that Scripture is powerless without the Church as the witness to its inspiration, the safeguard of its integrity, and the exponent of its meaning. And it will now be clear to all men which is the true Church, the real Mother to whom the Bible of right belongs. Nor will it need Solomon's wisdom to see that the so-called Church which heartlessly gives up the helpless child to be cut in pieces by textual critics cannot be the true Mother.

ART. VI.—CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN EQUATORIAL AFRICA.

1. *To the Central African Lakes and Back.* By JOSEPH THOMSON, F.R.G.S. London. 1881.
2. *Les Missions Catholiques.* Lyon.

IT is now nearly twenty years since a European traveller crossing a series of swelling heights, all tufted with sheeny plumes of plantain and banana, saw before him a great unknown freshwater sea which no white man had ever looked upon before.

It proved to be the mighty reservoir which feeds with the gathered rainfall of a vast tropical region the mysterious current of the White Nile, at a distance of three thousand miles from the point where it discharges the volume of its waters into the Mediterranean. This equatorial sea washes the shores of a strange but powerful kingdom, Uganda, or the Land of Drums, which, thus isolated in the remote heart of Africa, possesses nevertheless a certain amount of relative civilization. Rejoicing in the exuberant bounty of tropical Nature, it is rich in fat herds and luscious fruits, and supports a numerous and thriving population in perennial and never-failing plenty. Self-sufficing and self-subsisting, as it has nothing to desire, it has also nothing to fear from the world without, and is sufficiently organized to resist internal disorder or external attack under a form of government bearing a shadowy resemblance to the feudal despotisms of mediæval Europe. Its ruler, the Kabaka, or Emperor, Mtesa, holds barbarous State in his palisaded capital, attended by files of guards, by obsequious courtiers, by pages swift as winged Mercuries to convey his orders, and by the terrible "Lords of the Cord," or State executioners, ready on the merest movement of his eyelids to draw sword on the designated victim and send his severed head rolling to the tyrant's feet. This redoubtable potentate, who at the time when the first English traveller, Captain Speke, visited his Court, was scarcely more than a boy in years, combines all the furious passions of the African race with a high degree of nervous excitability. The result is an electric temperament, in which outbursts of sunny geniality are liable to be interrupted, like those of the tropical sky, by sinister caprices equally swift and sudden. On an excursion to an island in the lake on which the above-mentioned explorer accompanied him, one of the women of his train offered the youthful despot a tempting fruit she had plucked in the woods. Instead of accepting it, he turned on her in a paroxysm of bestial rage and ordered her for immediate execution, nor did the terrible incident appear to mar for a moment his enjoyment of the day's pleasure.

When Mtesa declares war against an enemy, 150,000 warriors in their savage bravery of paint and feathers muster under their respective chiefs, and defile past the royal standard in the panther-like trot which is their marching style; while a canoe fleet 230 strong, manned by from 16,000 to 20,000 rowers and spearmen, appears to join the naval rendezvous upon the lake. Tributary monarchs do homage to the powerful sovereign of Uganda as their liege lord; neighbouring states send embassies to invoke his alliance; and his great vassals, each in his own province ruling with delegated authority equal to his own,

cower and tremble in his presence like the most abject of slaves.

Seated in his chair of State, his feet resting on a leopard skin, and clad in no unkingly fashion in a gold embroidered coat over an ample snowy robe, a Zanzibar sword by his side, a tarbouche or crimson fez upon his closely shaven head, his aspect is not without a certain impressiveness conferred by the sense of conscious power. His mobile bronze features have something of the terrible fascination with which the association of slumbering ferocity invests the repose of a wild beast, and few even of white men conscious of all the prestige of civilization to sustain them, have met without a feeling of involuntary awe the glance of the large vivid eyes, in whose glooming shadows lurk such suggestions of latent fury. The whole scene of his Court, with the discordant clangour of wild music, the braying of ivory horns, roll of drums, and shrill dissonance of fifes, the prostrate forms within, the acclaiming thousands outside, the guards motionless as monumental bronzes, presents a combination of outlandish strangeness bewildering to the European visitor; while the picturesque costumes, white mantles of silky-haired goatskin, clay-coloured robes of bark-cloth draping dark athletic forms—for all are decently clad, and the law prescribes a minimum of covering without which the poorest may not stir abroad*—furnish elements of pictorial effect not often found in African life. A rude but powerful society is here made manifest, and something like the raw material of civilization may be found in this land of primitive plenty and comfort beneath the equator.

Nor is the king a mere untutored savage; his demeanour is not wanting in dignity, and both he and his principal courtiers have acquired a foreign language, in addition to their native tongue, both speaking and writing the Kiswaheli,† or Arab dialect of the Eastern coast. Mtesa has even some claim to rank among royal authors, for he has certain tablets, made of thin slabs of cottonwood, which he calls his "books of wisdom," on which he has noted down the results of his conversations with the European travellers who have visited his Court. A strange volume would these reminiscences of the African monarch prove, should they, in these days of universal publication, find their way to the printing press!

The ruler of Uganda has always shown a marked preference

* Even Captain Grant's knickerbockers were not considered sufficiently decorous for an appearance at Court in Uganda.

† The African languages are largely infected by the use of prefixes altering the sense of the words, thus:—U means country, as U-Rundi; M, a single native, as M-Rundi; Wa, people; Ki, language, as Wa-Ganda, Ki-Ganda, the people and language of Uganda.

for the society of white men, whose visits supply his only form of intellectual excitement. Astute and imaginative, he has dreams of material advantages from their friendship, and is anxious for European alliances against Egypt, whose advances towards his northern frontier have made him uneasy as to the chance of an attack. Thus policy and inclination combine to make him desirous of attracting foreigners to his dominions. He either feigns or feels a deep interest in theological discussions, and has coquetted with more than one alien creed. A Mussulman teacher, Muley-bin-Salim, previous to Stanley's visit in 1875, had acquired a certain influence over his mind, and effected a considerable improvement in his morals. Since then, he has abandoned the use of the strong native beer which fired his blood to madness, and has consequently been somewhat more humane in his conduct. His subsequent apparent leaning to Christianity roused Mr. Stanley's zeal with the desire to secure so valuable a convert: the translation of a portion of the Bible prepared for his benefit by the enterprising American traveller, seemed to make some impression on him, and his request for missionaries excited the emulation of Christendom in his behalf. The missionaries have gone; Catholic and Protestant divines have expounded their doctrines in his presence, but Mtesa is still a pagan, and by the last accounts more indomitably fixed in his old beliefs than ever. Fitful as a child, though now in mature manhood, he catches at each new form of excitement to satisfy the cravings of his quick and eager intelligence; then comes a change of mood, and the restless, undisciplined nature turns in another direction. Such is the man on whose caprices depend the spiritual destinies of Equatorial Africa.

We must now transport the reader from Uganda and its Court to a different scene, whose connection with it, not at first very obvious, will develop later on. On the heights of El-Biar stood, in the year 1868, an unpretending dwelling, overlooking the blue bay of Algiers, and the town solidly white in the sunshine, as though sculptured from a marble quarry on the hillside. There, three lads, just issuing from childhood, were undergoing a course of preparation for the arduous task to which they had spontaneously consecrated themselves, and which was, indeed, nothing less than the apostolate of Africa. From such a small beginning has grown in the thirteen years since past, a numerous and active religious body, now taking a leading part in the regeneration of the continent which gave it birth.

The story of the Algerian Missions belongs to what may be called the romance of religion. It is told by Mgr. Lavigerie, Archbishop of Algiers, in a letter published serially in numbers of *Les Missions Catholiques*, extending from the 4th of March to

the 6th of May, 1881, in which he reviews the question of the evangelization of Africa.

The French conquest of Algeria in 1830 restored to Christianity that portion of the soil of Africa, but the authorities, fearing to excite against them the spirit of Mussulman fanaticism by any appearance of proselytism, strictly limited the ministrations of the clergy to their own fellow-countrymen, the European settlers, and forbade all interference with the religion of the natives. Thus, though the Trappists* established themselves, in 1843, at Staouéli, the scene of the first French victory, and showed the Arabs by their example what wealth of produce might be extracted from their soil under careful cultivation, though the Jesuits were allowed to open schools for the native children in Kabylia, no preaching of Christian doctrine was admitted in combination with the secular and practical lessons taught by these Orders. Many of the Algerian clergy, nevertheless, entertained the hope that the French occupation was destined to lead to the introduction of Christianity into Africa; and posted thus at the gate of the great heathen continent, they held themselves in readiness until a way should be opened for them to enter it. Mgr. Lavigerie tells us that this expectation alone induced him to give up an episcopal see in France for the missionary diocese of Algiers. It was the misfortunes of the natives during a dreadful famine, which in 1868 devastated the country, that first brought them into somewhat closer relations with the French clergy, and led to the need being felt for a body of men fitted by special training to deal with them. The terrible character of this catastrophe may be inferred from the fact, that within a few months a fifth of the population perished in the districts where it prevailed. The Arab met his fate with his usual apathetic resignation to the inevitable, covered his head with the folds of his white burnouse, muttered, "*Kismet*," and died. But the dearth of material sustenance was the harvest-home of charity. All through the country thousands of native children were left a prey to starvation, bereft of parents and kinsfolk, orphans of the famine. The Archbishop sent out his priests and nuns into the streets and highways, organized relief expeditions to remote places, despatched his emissaries far and wide to collect all these helpless derelicts of suffering humanity, and bring them into the archiepiscopal palace in Algiers. The quest was a productive one. Soon the streets of the city witnessed a sad spectacle, as mules, ambulances, and waggons began to arrive with their piteous freight—children of all ages, in every stage of emaciation and

* One of their principal crops is the geranium, indigenous to the soil, and cultivated over large tracts to be manufactured into perfumes in the south of France. They have also introduced the culture of the vine.

inanition, many already beyond the reach of human aid. There ensued a curious scene, for the little creatures, even in the last extremity of suffering, manifested the liveliest terror at finding themselves in the hands of the *Roumis*—Christians, or Roman Catholics—who, they had been taught to believe, lived by sucking the blood of children. These fears were however quickly dissipated by the tender solicitude of their kind captors, and they soon reconciled themselves to their new home.

When results could be ascertained, the Archbishop found himself at the head of a family of two thousand orphans, with the whole charge of their education and maintenance thrown upon him. He joyfully accepted the responsibility, for the rescued little ones were objects of special interest to him, not only as so many young lives preserved by his instrumentality, but also as the possible seed of Arab Christianity in the future. But in the care of his orphanages and other institutions originating like them in the famine, he much required the help of an ecclesiastical body specially trained for intercourse with the natives, as the French clergy, rigorously excluded from all ministrations among them, were unacquainted even with their language. We shall let him tell in his own words how this need was supplied, as if in miraculous answer to his wishes, by a totally unexpected offer from M. Girard, Superior of the Ecclesiastical Seminary of Kouba, who had long shared his desires for the evangelization of the natives.

On that day then (writes Mgr. Lavigerie), this venerable son of St. Vincent de Paul, in every way worthy of such a spiritual father, appearing before me with three pupils of his seminary, said: "These young men are come to offer themselves to you for the African apostolate—with God's grace, this will be the beginning of the work we have so much desired." I seem to see him, as with his white head bowed he knelt before me, with his three seminarists, and begged me to bless and accept their devotion. I did indeed bless them, filled at once with astonishment and emotion, for I had received no previous intimation of this offer; and coinciding exactly with the anxieties occupying my mind at the moment, it seemed to me almost like the result of supernatural interposition. I bade them rise and be seated; I interrogated them at length; I brought forward, as was my duty, all possible objections. They answered them, and my consent was at last given to a trial by way of experiment.

Thus it was that the work began in humble fashion, from elements to all appearance the most feeble; an aged man already on the verge of the grave, three young men, or, more properly speaking, three children scarcely entered upon life.

I was incapable, as I have already said, of devoting myself to the task of their training, and yet it was indispensable, for a special vocation, to separate them from the great seminary. Providence itself

provided me with the means of doing this, by sending to Algiers, in search of a mild climate, two saintly religious, both since dead. One belonged to the Jesuit Society, the other to that of the Priests of Saint Sulpice. At that very time they had been asking me for some duty compatible with their declining strength. I established them with our three seminarists in a humble house which was to be let on the heights of El-Biar overlooking Algiers from the south. There, in former days, the French army coming from Staouéli compelled this ancient nest of Mussulman pirates to conclude the struggle, and throw open to the civilized world the gates of barbarism. Such was the first noviciate.

From this insignificant beginning the institution of Algerian missionaries grew and extended so rapidly as to number at the present time a hundred priests, in addition to lay-brothers and a hundred and thirty postulants and novices. Their mother-house is the Maison-Carrée near Algiers, memorable as the scene of the heroic end of forty French soldiers, who, at the time of the invasion, surrounded and overpowered by a Mussulman force, were offered life and protection if they would embrace Islamism, and refusing to abjure their religion, were shot down to a man. Here the missionaries have now quite a little colony, as dependencies of various kinds are grouped round the central building.

Among the first charges confided to them were naturally the orphanages, the objects of Mgr. Lavigerie's special solicitude. He had long had a plan in connection with them, which many at first deemed chimerical, but which has been so successfully carried out, as not only to fulfil the end immediately in view, but to furnish the model of a system imitated wherever practicable in all subsequent missionary enterprise in Africa. This was to provide for the future of his orphan protégés, by forming them into independent communities, encouraging marriages between the girls and young men he had reared, and establishing the youthful couples as they thus paired off, in dwellings prepared for them on a tract of land purchased expressly, and divided into allotments sufficient each for the support of a family.

Thus have been called into existence the Christian villages of St. Cyprien and Ste. Monique, situated at a distance of 180 kilomètres from Algiers on the railway which runs from that city to Oran, along what was in former times the line of the great highway of an older civilization, leading from Carthage to the Pillars of Hercules. The passing traveller sees groups of white dwellings embowered in carob trees and eucalyptus, clustered round a little church on the brown hillside; below the Chelif winds like a silver ribbon through the plain, into which jut the lower spurs of the mountains of Kabylia. If he ask a

European travelling companion the name of one of these little Christian colonies in the wilderness, he will be told it is St. Cyprien du Tighsel, so called from a rivulet running close by. But should he, in straying through the wild mountains to the south, put the same question to a wandering Arab, he will receive a different answer, and will hear it described in more poetic language, as the "village of the children of the marabout," for so is Mgr. Lavigerie styled among the natives.

The interior arrangements of these little hamlets are characterized by an air of neatness and comfort, contrasting favourably with the squalor of the ordinary Kabyle village. Next to this peculiarity, what will most strike a stranger will probably be the extreme youth of all the inhabitants. No withered crone is to be seen guiding the movements of the children playing at the house-doors; no grey-haired elders are there to counsel the younger men at their avocations. To their spiritual fathers alone can they look for guidance and direction, for the Algerian missionaries are here in their field of activity among the natives.

But the great gala of the inhabitants is when the Archbishop comes in person to visit the colonies he has planted. The little ones, who already begin to abound in every youthful household, stand in no awe of the ecclesiastical dignity of "Grand-papa Monseigneur," as the good prelate loves to hear them call him, for these children of his charity in the second generation are the spoiled pets of his paternal affection. He cannot even bear to have them excluded from the little church when he goes there to hold solemn service, though the addition of such very juvenile members to the congregation introduces an unmistakable element of distraction into its devotions. The Arabs and Kabyles from the mountains in the neighbourhood, when they come to make acquaintance with their Christian fellow-countrymen, are struck with admiration and wonder at what they see. "Never," they exclaim, holding up their hands in astonishment, "would your own fathers, if they had been alive, have done so much for you as the great marabout of the Christians!"

The visits of these natives have given rise to a further extension of the work of beneficence. It is an invariable rule of the Order of the Algerian Missionaries to tend with their own hands all the sick who come before them; and as the fame of their medical skill extended through the mountains, patients began to flock into them from far and wide. Those who were present when these poor infirm creatures collected, with imploring gestures, round the Fathers, dressed too in the native costume, seemed to see one of the scenes of the New Testament re-enacted before their eyes.

But many of these sufferers required prolonged care, which the missionaries, living at great distances from their homes, were unable to bestow on them. Then Mgr. Lavigerie, ever inventive in good works, began to revolve a new idea, that of erecting, in the village of St. Cyprien, a hospital for natives, where they should be received and tended gratuitously. There were of course great difficulties in the way of such an undertaking, primarily and principally the necessity of raising a very large sum of money before it could, in common prudence, be even set on foot. But this difficulty was unexpectedly overcome by the munificent help of General Wolff, commandant of the division of Algiers, who, having at his disposal a considerable military fund destined for charities among the natives, made it over to the Archbishop to be used in carrying out his project. The remainder of the sum required was raised by public subscription; and the hospital, dedicated to St. Elizabeth, the patron saint of Madame Wolff, became an accomplished fact.

It was inaugurated on the 5th of February, 1876, with a scene of picturesque festivity, when Mgr. Lavigerie dispensed hospitality on a Homeric scale of liberality, not only to a large number of visitors brought by special train from Algiers and entertained within doors in European fashion, but also to the Arabs of the neighbouring tribes. These wild guests assembled in thousands, and picnicked in the open air, feasting in primitive style on sheep and oxen roasted whole, suspended above great fires on wooden poles run through their headless carcasses. A thousand Arab cavaliers executed the "fantasia," their national tournament, seeming like so many demon horsemen as they wheeled to and fro in mad career, uttering savage war-cries, flinging spears and rifles into the air, and catching them as they fell, breaking into squadrons, re-uniting, chasing, and flying, like clouds of sand swept along by the whirlwind of the desert. The Frankish visitors enjoyed this performance, viewed from a safe distance, more than they did the simulated attack on the train, with which the same wild horsemen had saluted their arrival in the morning, and which was represented with a realistic force somewhat trying to feminine nerves.

It was but a few weeks previous to this joyous celebration that the Algerian missionaries, hitherto occupied only with these works among the natives under French rule, had undertaken the first of the more distant enterprises with which their Order was destined to be widely associated. Three of their number started for Timbuctoo, with orders to found there a Christian colony, or die in the attempt. Père Duguerry, their Superior, accompanied them to the confines of Algeria, and last saw them as they rode off on camel-back into the desert, intoning the *Te Deum* in

chorus. Weeks passed without any news of them, and then vague rumours of their death began to circulate among the nomad population of the Northern Sahara. Time confirmed these sinister reports, and their bodies were finally discovered by some ostrich hunters, more than thirty days' march from the coast, on the southern edge of the Sahara, some distance from the caravan route. They are believed to have been massacred by the savage Touaregs, or Isghers, who recently annihilated the French exploring expedition under Colonel Platters. Yet the Algerian missionaries at present wandering among these same, or kindred tribes, in search of a favourable locality in which to establish themselves, have met with a pacific and even cordial reception. The attempt to advance in the direction of Timbuctoo, has, however, for the present been abandoned.

A new field of enterprise has been opened to the Algerian Missions by an agency unconnected in itself with any religious objects. In 1877 was founded, under the stimulus supplied by the narratives of a series of travellers, the International African Association, consisting of ten States, under the presidency of the King of the Belgians, for the systematic and combined exploration of the continent. According to the programme of this new crusade against barbarism, as its founders termed it, its destined field of operations is bounded on the east and west by the two seas, on the south by the basin of the Zambesi, and on the north by the recently conquered Egyptian territory, and the independent Soudan. Through this vast and imperfectly explored region, the Association designs to establish permanent stations of supply, where travellers can be sheltered, and caravans refitted, and Ujiji, Nyangwe, and Kabebe, or some other point in the dominions of the Muata Yanvo, have been designated as among the points most suitable for the purpose.

It is no longer (writes Mgr. Lavigerie) a matter of isolated explorers, but of regular expeditions, in which money is not spared any more than men. Thus, under a vigorous impetus, an uninterrupted chain of stations is being established from Zanzibar to Lake Tanganyika, where the Belgian explorers have founded their central establishment of Karema; while on the west Stanley is ascending the course of the Congo, and forming dépôts along its shores. The day is then not far distant when the representatives of the International African Association, coming from the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, will meet on the lofty plateaux where the two great rivers of Africa, the Nile and the Congo, take their rise.

But (as he goes on to say) the Church must have her part in this work of civilization, and must not let herself be anticipated in these new countries by all the other European influences to which they will soon be thrown open. It was not long before the

death of Pius IX. that Cardinal Franchi, Prefect of the Propaganda, directed his attention to the labours of the Brussels Conference, and their probable effect on the future of a country nearly as large as Europe, and containing a population estimated by some at a hundred million souls. The heads of all the principal Missions in Africa were consulted, and were unanimous in recognizing the greatness of the religious interests at stake, but the difficulty was to find a body of men sufficiently zealous and trained for labour in this new field, who had not already undertaken other engagements requiring all their energies and resources. This was the case with all the old-established religious congregations in Africa, which had each its own sphere of operations and could not abandon it for a fresh experiment, and the Algerian Missions, newly-organized, full of fervour, and comparatively free from the claims of other duties, were the only ones available for the new undertaking. For, while their numbers had continued steadily to increase, many of the charges which had been their first care, had now ceased to provide them with full occupation; and the orphanages, in particular, at the lapse of nine or ten years from their foundation, had nearly fulfilled their function, as the children of the famine were, as we have seen, being otherwise provided for.

Thus the priests of the Society were able to accept unhesitatingly the charge of the Missions to Equatorial Africa, as soon as it was proposed to them; and in an address to the Holy See declared their joyful readiness to devote themselves to the cause. But the Pontiff who had called them to their arduous task was not destined to speed them on their way. Two of the Algerian missionaries arrived in Rome in January, 1878, as a deputation from the Order, to lay their declaration of acceptance at the feet of Pius IX., and receive his final benediction and instructions; but his death intervened before he had signed the decree authorizing the commencement of their task. The fulfilment of the intentions of his predecessor in this respect was one of the first acts of the Pontificate of Leo XIII., and the rescript giving effect to them is dated the 24th of February, four days only after his accession. The territory confided to the Missions thus created is identical with that selected as its scene of operations by the International Association, and extends across the entire width of the continent of Africa, from ten degrees north to fifteen south of the line. Four missionary centres, intended later to become Vicariates Apostolic, have been created; two on Lakes Nyanza and Tanganyika; one at Kabebe, in the territory of the Muata Yanvo, and one at the northern extremity of the course of the Congo. Most of these stations will occupy the same points as those selected by the European explorers, whose track across

Africa the Algerian missionaries will thus precede or follow. In order that they might be first in the field and anticipate the teachers of any other form of Christianity, it was the special desire of the Pope that they should start without delay, and accordingly, on the 25th of March, a month after the signature of the decree, the little band were on their way to Zanzibar.

They numbered ten, of whom five, Pères Pascal, Deniaud, Dromaux, Delaunay, and Frère Auger, were destined for the Mission of Lake Tanganyika; and an equal number, Pères Livinhac, Girault, Lourdel, Barbot, and Frère Amance, for that of the Victoria Nyanza. Our readers are doubtless aware that a special ceremony of adieu is prescribed by the liturgy to celebrate the departure of missionaries for a distant station. At the close of the service all present, beginning with the ecclesiastic of highest dignity, advance to kiss the feet of the new apostles, messengers of that Gospel of Peace, surely nowhere more needed than in the torn and bleeding heart of Africa.

The Algerian Missionaries who sailed from Marseilles at the end of March, landed at Zanzibar on the 29th of April. Then began those scenes of feverish bustle and anxiety attending the process of organizing a caravan for the interior, in which the travellers were aided by the energetic co-operation of Père Charnetant, Procureur-General of their Society, come to speed them with his help and advice on the first stages of their journey. The whole success of an African expedition depends on the character of the men chosen to compose it, and especially on the efficiency of the head-men, whose influence over their subordinates is analogous to that of the officers of a regiment over the rank and file. The caravan, whether for trade, exploration, or religious colonization, is always constituted in the same way, and generally comprises two distinct categories of men. The first are the Wangwana, negroes of Zanzibar, of whom we read so much in all narratives of African travel, engaged to form the armed escort of the party, and termed *askaris*, from the Arabic word, *aschkar*, a soldier. They are a jovial, pleasure-loving crew, vain and light-hearted, averse to discipline, and liable to sudden panics and fitful changes of mood. They have, however, their counterbalancing virtues, and, when headed by a leader who inspires them with confidence, are capable of prolonged endurance of toil and suffering, and of courageous fidelity to their employer.

The second class are the porters, or *pagazis*, of the expedition, generally consisting of Wanyamwezi, natives of the province of Unyamwezi, lying to the east of the great Lake district. Being in a lower stage of civilization than the Wangwana, they have the greater measure of both good and bad qualities implied by that difference, are wilder and more unmanageable, but, on the

other hand, less enervated by vices and excesses than the more self-indulgent natives of the coast. For this reason they are superior as porters, as their greater hardihood and exemption from disease enables them better to bear the continuous strain of carrying a heavy load through a long march.

In addition to these two classes of men, there are in every expedition a certain number of *kirangozis*, or guides, whose duty it is to head the different sections of the column on the march, keep order in the ranks, and select the route, and who may be compared to the non-commissioned officers in a regiment. They carry lighter loads than the rank and file, and are distinguished by the fantastic brilliancy of their apparel, by plumed head-dresses, flowing scarlet robes, and the skins or tails of animals worn as decorations. Preceded by a noisy drummer-boy, and led by these barbaric figures, the long serpentine file of an African caravan forms a sufficiently picturesque spectacle, as emerging from the reeds or jungle, it winds over open ground to some village on its road.

But the hiring and selection of his native followers is not the only care that engages the traveller preparing for an African expedition. As no form of coin is current in the interior, he has to take a bulky equivalent in the shape of goods, for the expenses of his entire force along the way; and the purchase, assortment, and classification of his varied stock-in-trade is a task of some difficulty. Chaos seems come again; while in a room strewn with all the litter of a packing-house, with shreds of matting, fragments of paper, and the wreck of tin boxes and wooden cases, black figures keep coming and going depositing the most miscellaneous loads, of which bales of unbleached cotton, striped and coloured cloths, glass beads of every size and hue, and coils of brass wire, are the most conspicuous. In the midst of this scene of confusion, with a Babel of tongues and clatter of hammers going on all round, and at a temperature of 80° Fahr., each load has to be arranged and numbered, its contents enumerated, and its place in the catalogue carefully assigned. Such is the task that awaits the traveller at Zanzibar.

The goods most in use are *merikani*, a strong white cotton, of American manufacture, as its name implies; *kaniki*, a blue cloth; and *satini*, a lighter and more flimsy fabric. These are reckoned by the *doti*, a measure of about four yards, and are used by the natives in such elementary forms of clothing as they affect.

Beads, manufactured in Venice for the African market, must be chosen with special reference to the prevailing fashion among the tribes they are intended for, as each has its own special predilection. Different varieties are exported to the opposite coasts

of Africa, so that finding some of the natives of the interior in the possession of a particular sort was a sufficient proof to Livingstone that he had crossed, so to speak, the watershed between the two great streams of traffic, and arrived from the east, at the region whose products are borne to the Atlantic. The caprices of savage taste are sometimes as fleeting as those of European fashion, and the last and youngest African explorer, Mr. Thomson, tells us in his narrative, how he transported to the shores of Lake Tanganyika a cargo of a special form of these glass wares, which his head man Chumah had on his last visit seen in great request there, but the fancy for which had in the interval so completely passed away, that the traveller found them utterly useless.

Brass wire, a somewhat ponderous form of metallic currency, is also in great vogue among the African fashionables as an ornament for their persons; so much so, that in the spirit of the French proverb, *Il faut souffrir pour être belle*, they are content to carry immense loads of it round their necks, arms, or ankles, with a view to increasing their attractions.

In addition to these ordinary wares, the Fathers had provided themselves with various ornamental cloths to propitiate the chiefs; and Mgr. Lavigerie, with a special view to the taste of the great potentates Mirambo and Mtesa, had commissioned a friend in Paris to ransack the bazaars of the Temple for the cast-off finery of the Second Empire, and lay in a stock of the State robes of ex-senators and ministers. This was done, and a result was hoped for as satisfactory as that which had once ensued from presenting an American Indian Chief with the second-hand uniform of the beadle of St. Sulpice, which he wore, as his sole garment, on the occasion of the next solemn festival, and thus attired took part in the procession, to the great edification of all beholders.

The organization of the missionary caravan was much more rapidly accomplished than that of most similar expeditions; and the preparations in which months are usually spent were completed in a few weeks. Three hundred pagazis were engaged at a hundred francs a head to act as carriers to Unyamwezi, whence the two Missions were to take separate roads, the one to Lake Tanganyika, and the other to the Victoria Nyanza. The entire baggage of the party weighed a hundred quintals, and the separate loads about 35 kilos. each. When the askaris, or guards, and all supernumeraries were reckoned, the force numbered five hundred men.

The Algerian Fathers were much assisted by the co-operation of the Missionaries of the Holy Ghost at Zanzibar and Bagamoyo, where their admirable establishments, founded by Père

Horner, since dead, form the admiration of all travellers. They have proceeded on the plan of ransoming children from the slave dealers, training them to some trade or industry, and establishing them in rural colonies under their own immediate care. One of the lay-brothers is an experienced mechanical engineer, having studied in the most celebrated workshops in Europe, that of Krupp among others, and the Mission is consequently able to execute orders for the construction or repairs of machinery in the best way. In 1873, Sir Bartle Frere, in his official report, spoke of these establishments in the following terms:—"I should find it impossible to suggest the slightest improvement in this Mission in any direction. I shall cite it as a model to be followed by those who at any time desire to civilize and Christianize Africa." The Fathers have recently established an inland station at Mhonda, among the mountains, eleven days' march from the coast, at a height of a thousand mètres above the sea, where they have been well received by the natives.

It was on the 16th of June, 1878, that the Algerian Missionaries took leave of these kind friends and fellow-labourers, and set out on their long road from Bagamoyo to the Great Lakes. In addition to their human carriers, they took with them twenty asses, the only beasts of burden which withstand the fatal effects of the tsetse bite. The path taken was the ordinary caravan route followed by Arab trade with the interior, and by constant traffic rendered safe for a well-equipped party, unless it should become entangled in the hostilities frequently going on between the natives. The greatest annoyance to which travellers through this part of the country are liable is the constant exaction of *hongo*, or tribute, on the part of every petty chief through whose territory they pass, and their diaries are little else than a narration of the delays and vexations caused by incessant negotiations with these grasping savages. On the latter part of the route a fresh centre of disturbance has of late years been created in the country by the growing power of Mirambo, "that terrible phantom," as Stanley calls him, whose name is a bugbear to travellers and traders. Originally a petty chief of Unyamwezi, he has rendered himself formidable by gathering around him all the elements of disorder and violence so prevalent in African society; and his predatory bands, known as *Ruga-Rugas*, are dreaded alike by foreigners and natives. Their raids keep the country in a ferment, and some of their light skirmishers are constantly lying in wait in the jungles to pick up stragglers from the caravans. The Arabs are, however, the objects of his special enmity, and he is in general more favourably disposed to Europeans.

The first marches of the missionary caravan lay through the

rich but unwholesome lowlands that line the coast, where the damp soil, soaked with moisture after the *masika*, or rainy season, is a hot-bed of fever, exhaling poisonous miasma. All the travellers suffered more or less from the effects of the climate, which they tried to counteract by powerful doses of quinine and other remedies. The landscape displayed the glories of African vegetation, and the dense foliage of the forests sheltered tropical birds, and was the home of black and white monkeys; which bounded chattering from tree to tree. The road the travellers followed is but a narrow track along which the column wound in single file, sometimes plunging through matted under-wood and dense cane-brakes, sometimes with the loads carried by the men just showing above a sea of rank tall grass, waving as high as their heads on either side. Wherever this path forked, the leaders of the party broke off a branch and laid it across the opening of the false turn as a signal to those who came after to avoid it. Rivers and streams had to be crossed either on the slippery trunk of a tree felled so as rudely to bridge them over, or by wading through the current where a practicable ford occurred. The first trifling misadventure in the camp occurred on June 18, and is narrated in the diary of the missionaries, published serially in *Les Missions Catholiques*.

Just as we were sitting down to dinner under a tree, a few steps away from the camp, all the men of our caravan, askaris and pagazis, rushed to arms, uttering furious cries. We ran to the scene of tumult and found that the camp had caught fire, and that the conflagration was rapidly approaching our baggage. Our first care was to extinguish it, which we did, with the aid of the soldiers, but the shouts and tumult continued. The pagazis cocked their guns, uttering wild shrieks and threatening to fire on the soldiers. The fight was then between the Wangwana askaris and the Wanyamwezi pagazis. At last, by dint of preaching peace, and desiring weapons to be laid aside, we succeeded in restoring order. We then learned the cause of all this disturbance. An askari had lost the stopper of his powder flask, a pagazi had picked it up and kept it. The theft discovered, the two men had come to blows, and the contagion of their wrath and fury had soon spread to the entire caravan. Happily the incident had no serious consequences.

The ordinary day's march of an African expedition is necessarily short, as it represents only a portion of the day's work performed by the men. It is generally got over very early in the morning, beginning at five o'clock, so that the halting place is reached by ten or eleven, before the sun has attained its full power. The preparations for encamping then commence, fire-wood and water have to be procured, and the men proceed to construct huts for themselves of an umbrella-shaped frame-work of

boughs, thatched with bundles of long grass fastened together at the top. Others meantime are busied in lighting the fires, in cooking, or in setting up the tents of the travellers, and otherwise attending to their comfort. It is an extraordinary instance of the physical endurance of the men, that frequently on arriving at an encampment, apparently completely exhausted by a long march, they will, after a short rest, spring up, and begin one of their wild and furious dances, spending the night in a perfect frenzy of movement instead of sleeping off the fatigues of the day.

Sometimes in the evening the Kirangozis (guides) address orations to their men in the style of that quoted by Stanley, in "How I found Livingstone."

"Hearken, Kirangozis! Lend ear, O Sons of the Wanyamwezi! The journey is for to-morrow. The path is crooked, the path is bad. There are jungles where more than one man will be concealed. The Wagogo strike the pagazis with their lances; they cut the throats of those who carry stuff and beads. The Wagogo have come to our camp; they have seen our riches; this evening they will go to hide in the jungle. Be on your guard, O Wanyamwezi! Keep close together; do not delay; do not linger behind. Kirangozis, march slowly, so that the weak, the children, the sick, may be with the strong. Rest twice on the road. These are the words of the master. Have you heard them, Sons of the Wanyamwezi?"

A unanimous cry replies in the affirmative.

"Do you understand them?"

Fresh affirmative cries.

"It is well." Night falls, and the orator retires into his hut.

The missionaries had to encounter more than one threatened mutiny in their camp, the men demanding increased pay or other indulgences, and on one of these occasions eight of the soldiers were dismissed and sent back to the coast. The inefficiency of their caravan leader threw the task of keeping order among the mixed and barbarous multitude of their followers principally on the Fathers, and the incompatibility of this office, entailing the necessity of energetic remonstrances and threats, with the dignity of their priestly character, suggested the idea, since carried out, of requesting ex-Papal Zouaves to accompany future missionary caravans, in order to enforce military discipline in their ranks.

On Sundays the caravan was halted, and the missionaries prepared to celebrate Mass, with all the pomp and solemnity possible under the circumstances. In the principal tent an altar was erected, decorated with ornaments bestowed by Mgr. Lavigerie and sundry religious societies, while above it hung two banners embroidered by the Carmelite Nuns of Cité Bugeaud, near

Algiers. In this little sanctuary in the wilderness, High Mass was chanted by the Fathers, in sight of their dark-skinned heathen followers, who watched through the open door of the tent, in wonder not untinctured with superstitious awe, the ceremony which they had been told was the white man's most solemn rite of prayer.

On arrival in camp on the 5th of July, a soldier called Mabruki, failed to answer to the roll-call, and two of his comrades were sent back in search of him; he had carried off with him a whole piece of merikani and some articles belonging to the other soldiers, and was found in a village on the route, whence he was ignominiously brought back prisoner by the search party. His comrades tried him by a sort of drum-head court-martial, dismissed him from their ranks, and, after administering a flogging, sent him on his way back to the coast.

The party were now entering a wilder and more mountainous country, infested by wild animals, as described in the journal of July 6.

We passed through the village of Kikoka, now completely abandoned on account of the neighbourhood of lions. We were close to a camp where five or six members of a caravan had been devoured by these animals barely a month before.

Lions are one of the dangers of the journey from Zanzibar to the Great Lakes. They sometimes join together in packs of six or eight to hunt game. Some animals show fight against them successfully.* Lions never venture to attack the adult elephant, and even fly before the buffalo, unless they are more than two to one. In general they do not attack caravans, and never in the day-time. At most, a hungry lion may spring upon and carry off a straggler while passing through the brakes and jungles. But it is otherwise at night. When the lions scent the caravan from afar, particularly if it contain goats or beasts of burden, they approach and announce their vicinity by terrific roars. Nevertheless, in a well-enclosed camp there is no danger; the lions never attempt to clear the obstacles, and marksmen from behind the palisades can pick them off with almost unfailing aim. There is danger only when the camp is not completely enclosed, or when those inside go out to attack them. Then, if the lions are in force, they seldom fail to make some victims. This, no doubt, was what had happened to the caravan that had preceded us at Kikoka.

Some considerable streams intersected this part of the route, and as the rude tree-trunk bridges by which they were crossed afforded no footing to the asses, the only way found practicable for getting these animals across was to fasten a long rope round

* These details agree with those given by the German explorer, Dr. Holub, in his recent book, "Seven Years in South Africa."

their necks, by which ten men standing on the opposite shore hauled them by main force through the current. This process, which lasted some hours, had to be frequently repeated during the journey.

At intervals along the road the caravan came upon traces of the unsuccessful attempt made by the English missionaries of Ujiji to introduce transport by oxen into this part of Africa, in the shape of waggons abandoned by their owners in the villages they passed through, as the draught beasts had gradually succumbed to tsetse bite, fatigue, or the effects of feeding on unwholesome grasses. Approaching the village of Mpuapua on the 26th of July, they saw the English flag flying over a building which proved to be the residence of the Protestant missionaries permanently stationed there. They exchanged visits and other courtesies with these gentlemen, who charged themselves with the conveyance of their letters to Zanzibar.

A short time after leaving this station, the caravan had its first painful experience of a *tirikeza*, or forced march, across a parched and waterless desert, where rest can only be purchased at the price of endurance of thirst. Starting at six in the morning, they entered on a sandy plain, twelve leagues in breadth, which must be crossed in eighteen hours. At mid-day a short halt was made, after which they pressed on again till seven in the evening. Overpowered with fatigue, all lay down to sleep in the open air, round large fires, for neither huts nor tents were set up, and at five in the morning they had to start again, reaching at nine the inhabited country where they stopped for two days' rest.

They had now crossed the frontier of Ugogo, a mountainous plateau, forming the water-shed between the Indian Ocean and the Great Lakes. Hitherto the missionaries had met with no annoyance from the natives, and had not had to pay hongo, or tribute, once since leaving the coast. They were now to have a different experience, and found themselves surrounded at every moment by swarms of filthy and unsavoury savages, whom even the exertions of the soldiers could not succeed in banishing from the camp. Every movement of the *wasunga*, or white men, was watched with intense curiosity, but in a spirit of ridicule instead of admiration. Reeking with rancid butter, and clad only in a scrap of greasy cotton or sheep-skin, the Wagogo are anything but pleasant neighbours at close quarters; and a crowd of them in a small tent, jabbering and making faces at everything they saw, was an infliction that might gladly have been dispensed with. They enlarge the lobes of their ears by inserting pegs into them, to which they attach various articles of use or ornament, and are thus provided with a substitute for a pocket, a convenience they are precluded from the use of by the scantiness

of their apparel. In some cases this portion of the ear is so elongated by the weights attached to it as to reach to the shoulder. Provisions were cheap in Ugogo, ten eggs being given in exchange for a single pin; but, on the other hand, the travellers had now to submit to a series of exorbitant demands on the part of every village potentate whose territory they passed. These extortions amounted to hundreds of yards of cotton, with other goods in proportion, and were everywhere the subject of wearisome negotiations, and the cause of interminable delays. Thus it was twenty-one days before the caravan cleared this notorious province, lightened, in its passage, of nearly all the goods brought from the coast.

But the Fathers had to deplore, in Ugogo, a greater loss than that of their material resources, for it was here that the first serious misfortune overtook the little band, in the death of one of its most devoted members. Père Pascal, the destined Superior of the Mission of Lake Tanganyika, had suffered from slight attacks of fever, at intervals since leaving the coast, but his cheerful spirit and courage had sustained him in battling against the malady. As too often happens, however, in these malarious illnesses, the successive attacks increased instead of diminishing in intensity, and from the 14th of August he became very ill, passing restless nights with continual high fever. Nevertheless, when the caravan was starting on the morning of the 17th, though scarcely able to stand, and delirious at intervals, he insisted on mounting his ass, so as to leave the litter to one of his sick comrades. This was his last march; he grew so rapidly worse at the next halting-place that he could no longer be moved, and died at three in the afternoon of the 19th, without any appearance of suffering towards the close. His companions consoled themselves by recalling his many virtues, particularly the humility and charity for which he had been specially remarkable. On one occasion, in Algeria, he picked up a little Arab boy, abandoned by his parents to die, and covered with sores from head to foot, carried him home, and nursed him with the greatest tenderness. The child was beyond cure, but the good Father's care soothed his last hours, and the example of his charity won the heart of his charge to Christianity before he died.

Lest a death in the camp should be made the pretext for further exactions, the Fathers determined to transport the remains of Père Pascal by night, beyond the inhospitable frontier of Ugogo, which was now close at hand. At midnight then, after assembling for a last prayer of adieu, a little funeral band started in the darkness to seek a suitable place of sepulture. They found it in the great forest skirting the confines of Ugogo, and,

penetrating for about seven or eight kilomètres into its depths, buried the remains of their valued companion in that inaccessible tropical wilderness, marking the spot with a small wooden cross.

The travellers were now approaching the end of the first stage of their journey, where, in Unyanyembe, the roads to Lakes Victoria and Tanganyika divide, and the Missions destined for their respective shores would have to part company. They entered this province on the 12th of September, but were detained there many months, from the necessity of waiting for fresh supplies, those they had brought with them having been exhausted by the exactions of Ugogo. The contract, too, with the pagazis who had accompanied them from the coast, expired here, and these men were now back in their native country, Unyamwezi, the Land of the Moon, of which Unyanyembe, the Land of Hoes, is but a province. At the meeting point of the two caravan routes has sprung up the settlement of Tabora, which, like most of the localities in Equatorial Africa whose names have become familiar to the European reader, such as Ujiji and Nyangwe, are not native towns, but Arab colonies. Traders of that nation from the coast have gradually settled at these points in the interior, either for increased facilities of commerce, or because social disabilities, such as debt or crime, have rendered it desirable for them to be out of reach of civilization. Most of these immigrants have prospered, and some possess hundreds of slaves, flocks, herds, and other belongings. They have built roomy flat-roofed houses surrounded by the huts of their dependents, the whole generally enclosed by a strong stockade. Even in Stanley's time there were sixty or seventy such stockades in Tabora, and the number has probably increased since. Although these Arab settlers introduced a certain type of civilization, their morality is not calculated to raise the lowest African standard, and they are always inimical to Christianity, as a menace to the slave trade, one of their principal sources of profit.

Their presence at Tabora, however, was of use to the missionaries, as it enabled them to negotiate a loan and purchase goods to start for their further journey. It was not till the 12th of November that the caravan for Uganda, with Père Livinhac at its head, was able to set out once more, while the Tanganyika Mission, in which Père Deniaud had succeeded Père Pascal as Superior, was delayed, by the difficulty of obtaining fresh porters, until the 3rd of December. After a march, diversified only by the usual accidents of the way, by varieties of weather and landscape, by the more or less friendly dispositions of the Sultans through whose territory they passed, and their several degrees of rapacity in the matter of hongo, as well as by frequent alarms and scares of raids from the followers of Mirambo, the first party on

the 30th of December arrived at last in sight of their goal, and saw the grey Nyanza show like a film of gossamer against the softly veiled horizon. Calm and smiling in the equatorial sunshine that gilded its green shores, there lay the mysterious lake from which flows the mysterious river, the clue to so many enigmas, the key to the speculation of ages, the unveiled secret so long shrouded in the heart of Africa.

In three hours the missionaries were at Kaduma, a little village of scattered huts under the shade of clusters of trees by the shore of the lake. Some of them were accommodated in a hut, where still lay, covered with dust, various trifles, the relics of its last occupant, an English missionary of the name of Smith, who had died there some time before. The other Fathers were lodged under their tent. A fresh series of delays was in store for them before they could reach Uganda, still separated from them by the greatest diameter of the lake; and it was finally decided to send Père Lourdel, the best Arabic scholar of the party, with the lay-brother, to Mtesa's court, to prepare the way for the others, and beg him to send canoes to fetch them. On the 19th of January, 1879, the two envoys accordingly set forth in a crazy boat, which they themselves had to patch up, for their long coasting voyage round the lake. It lasted nearly a month, but was accomplished without accident, and at last, on the 17th of February, 1879, the first of the Algerian missionaries was face to face with the great potentate of Equatorial Africa. Mtesa was ill at this time, and almost constantly lying down, but he received the missionaries graciously, as he does all European strangers. There were five Protestant missionaries already at his capital, and there was at first some difficulty in their relations with the French priests, but they became afterwards very friendly with them. Mtesa assigned a lodging to Père Lourdel, sending him daily supplies of food, as is his custom with strangers visiting his dominions, and despatched immediately twenty canoes, under the guidance of Frère Amance, to bring the rest of the party to Rubaga.

They meantime had a weary time of waiting at Kaduma, in anxious uncertainty as to their future fate. The monotony of their lives was broken by the arrival, on the 14th of February, of two Englishmen on their way to join the Mission of Uganda. They exchanged visits with the Fathers, and the negroes were much astonished to hear the Wasunga, or white men, speaking to each other in Kiswaheli, the universal medium of communication throughout Equatorial Africa, where it plays the same part that French does on the continent of Europe. Mr. Mackay, the head of the Mission of Uganda, arrived soon after with a flotilla of boats to convey the new recruits to their destination, but

there was no sign of any means of transport for the Algerian Fathers.

They saw the people of Kaduma hold a dancing-festival in honour of the new moon, and were present at the wedding of the chief's son, in honour of which Père Barbot manufactured him a necklace of various coloured beads, to his great delight.

They suffered considerable annoyance from the theft by some of their soldiers of the gorgeous robes intended as a propitiatory offering to the King of Uganda; but they were fortunately recovered by the Arab Governor of Tabora, who sent them to their rightful owners by a caravan from Unyanyembe, which reached Kaduma on the 20th of April. A still more agreeable surprise was in store for them, in the shape of a packet of letters from Europe, delivered by the same agency, and containing for the poor exiles good news from home.

At last, on Whitsun eve, the 31st of May, the long-desired flotilla appeared on the horizon, and a few days later the welcome event of the embarkation of the party took place. The discipline of Mtesa's men was so excellent that nothing was stolen from their baggage on the way; and on the 19th of June, exactly a year after they had left Bagamoyo, they landed in Uganda on the north-western shore of the Victoria Nyanza. The king was favourably disposed towards them, and the well-chosen presents of Mgr. Lavigerie tended to confirm him in his gracious mood. The presence of so many rival missionaries in his capital had given him an opportunity for indulging his favourite passion for the theology, and he had already, on Monday, the 8th of June, presided at a triple conference, in which the representatives of Protestantism, Catholicity, and Islamism disputed before him on the merits of their respective creeds. A strange and interesting scene must have been the dark interior of that grass-thatched hall in the heart of Equatorial Africa, where the fierce-eyed pagan monarch, master of the future of half a continent, sat as umpire between the champions of three rival religions competing for his acceptance and support.

The balance turned for the moment in favour of Catholicity, for Père Lourdel, by his cure of Mtesa from a very serious illness, had gained some influence over his mind. The intrigues of the Arabs contributed to the same end; for, dreading beyond all things the hostility of England to the slave trade, they excited the king's jealous susceptibility against the missionaries of that nation by insinuating that they had in view the eventual annexation of his dominions. Nor was the wily African without an ulterior object in the favour he showed the new arrivals at his court, for he shortly began to sound them on the possibility of a French alliance with Uganda, the powerful

protection of some European state being one of the favourite dreams of his uninstructed but imaginative mind.

It was about six months after the arrival of the missionaries, that a sudden and inexplicable reaction in Rubaga, the capital of Uganda, seemed for a time to threaten a serious persecution of the Christian teachers, but in an equally unexplained fashion this momentary change of mood has again passed away without producing any effect. Emin Bey, Governor of the Egyptian Equatorial Provinces, communicated to *Petermann's Mittheilungen*, of November, 1880, the contents of a letter recently received by him from Uganda, describing a great council held by the king on the 23rd of December previous, where it was resolved to prohibit the teaching of the French and English missionaries alike, and to decree the penalty of death against any native receiving instruction from them. Mahometanism was also condemned, and all good subjects were recommended to adhere to the belief of their fathers. It was unanimously declared that no teaching was required in Uganda, the only improvement desirable being "that guns, powder, and percussion caps, should be as plentiful as grass." These resolutions were promulgated amid public rejoicings, with firing of guns and general acclamations, yet they have ever since remained a dead letter. The most recent letters from the Algerian missionaries in Rubaga, published in *Les Missions Catholiques*, of May 20, 1881, help perhaps to explain this inconsistency by showing us that politics in Uganda are not quite so simple as they at first sight appear. They tell us that Mtesa, despite his seemingly absolute power, is really controlled and hampered by the great chiefs who form his court and lead his armies. Among these formidable vassals there is evidently a conservative party opposed to innovation and vehemently inimical to European influence, for we are told that they go so far as to threaten the Kabaka, bidding him to go away with his white men, while they will raise one of his children to the throne. The pressure of this section of his chiefs was evidently sufficiently strong to force the acceptance of the anti-Christian decree on the king, but not as yet to compel its execution. The existence of such a party, however, shows one of the dangers to which the missionaries and their converts may at any moment become liable by a sudden change in the political situation of the country.

On the other hand, the Algerian Fathers see in the feudal organization of Uganda a prospect of facilities for their teaching. The great nobles holding the government of their respective provinces immediately of the king, transmit again their authority to a number of sub-chiefs or lesser vassals ruling over smaller districts, and bound to follow their superior's standard in the

field, each with his contingent of armed retainers. It is conjectured that this aristocratic class, including of course the king of Uganda, is descended from the Abyssinian Christians who came as conquerors at some remote epoch to the shore of the great Nyanza, and brought there the comparative civilization whose tradition still remains. It is through these powerful nobles, with their hereditary superiority to the ordinary negro, that the missionaries hope gradually to extend their influence in the country and reach the lowest orders, the slaves, or *wadou*, grouped in villages on the great estates.

As regards the material aspects of the Mission, the King presented the Fathers immediately with a piece of land, and sent workmen to build a house on it, constructed, like all the native dwellings, of reeds and grass. Strange visitors to the country, being considered as royal guests, are supplied daily with provisions. The banana furnishes almost the entire food of the population, and is cooked in various ways; plucked green, and wrapped in its own leaves, it is steamed and eaten as a vegetable, or ground after being dried, is used as flour. A sweet fermented drink called *maramba*, is made from its juice, and a similar beverage, *merissa*, is extracted from the plantain. The principal intoxicant, however, used in Uganda as in other parts of Africa, is *pombe*, a species of beer brewed from millet or other grain.

Mtesa's keen intelligence does not prevent him from being a slave to superstition; he trembles before the chief sorcerer, and worships fetishes and other idols. On the other hand he asked the Fathers for a catechism in *Kiswaheli*, and seems capable of reasoning logically on the truths it contains. He asked Père Lourdel one day if it were true, as Mr. Mackay had informed him, that in France baptism was administered to sheep and oxen, thinking the assertion so ridiculous that he added he thought the Protestant missionary must be mad to make it. Père Lourdel charitably preferred to conclude that Mtesa had misunderstood him.

On Easter eve, the 27th of March, 1880, the Algerian Fathers reaped the first fruits of their labours, in the baptism of four native catechumens, and on the following Whitsun eve, May 15th, an equal number of converts was received into the Church. The most interesting of these was a young soldier named *Fouké*, eighteen years of age, son of the great chief or tributary king of Usoga, called *Kabaka ana Massanga* (king of the elephant tusks), from the quantity of ivory he furnishes to his suzerain. His son's conversion originated in the missionaries' cure of a very bad injury to his hand, averting the amputation of a finger, which, according to the code of the country, would

have entailed degradation from the caste of the nobility to that of the slaves. He had been violently prejudiced against the Christians by the Mussulmans, whose teaching he had previously sought, but without being satisfied by it, and a sudden enlightenment of his mind seemed to urge him to demand baptism and instruction. The difficulties were placed before him—the possibility of persecution, the renunciation of polygamy; but he declared he had weighed them well, and was prepared for all sacrifices. His father, though still a Pagan, favours and protects the missionaries in every way.

Mtesa, though generally reluctant to allow strangers to settle anywhere save in his capital, was prevailed upon by Père Livinhac to allow the missionaries of the second caravan, which reached Lake Nyanza in April, 1880, to establish themselves in a tributary province of Uganda called Uwya, recommending them to the authorities there as his friends. They have thus two stations in this region, with fair prospects of success under the shadow of his powerful protection.

The Tanganyika branch of the expedition is differently circumstanced, as there is in their district no one chief with paramount authority at all comparable to that of Mtesa on the Nyanza. Having started from Tabora nearly a month later than their companions (on the 3rd of December, 1878), they sighted Lake Tanganyika on the 24th of January following, after a march through a country where tribute was demanded in the name of Mirambo, and where charred huts and devastated fields bore eloquent testimony to the destructive power of the great brigand chief. Ujiji, a long straggling Arab settlement by the shore, its low, flat-roofed houses scattered among maize fields and banana groves, with here and there a stately oil or cocoa-palm tossing aloft its plummy crown, was their first abode.

Here letters from Seyd Barghash, Sultan of Zanzibar, to Muini-Heri, the Arab governor, secured them the protection of the authorities, and having had assigned to them as their residence the same house occupied by Mr. Stanley during his visit, they proceeded to instal themselves in it, to have some necessary repairs executed, and to fit up a room as a little chapel. They directed their attention meantime to gathering information as to the neighbouring country, and learned that while the districts south of the lake were completely depopulated by the ravages of Mirambo's outlaws, the Ruga-Rugas, there was a healthy and populous region to the north, where a promising opening might be found for a station. Kabebe, the capital of the Muata Yanvo, one of the points already selected for missionary occupation, was described by Hassan, secretary to Muini-Heri, who had visited it, as distant five months' journey from Ujiji, and inhabited by

an amiable but savage population; the latter epithet being interpreted by the Fathers to mean that there were no Arabs amongst them.

From Mr. Hore, agent for the English Church Missionary Society at Ujiji, the Algerian Fathers received all possible kindness and assistance; and, with the single exception of Mr. Mackay at Uganda, who showed a spirit of hostility towards them, they bear testimony to the friendly dispositions manifested by the English missionaries wherever they came in contact with them.

Though all real authority in Ujiji is vested in the Arab governor, there is also a titular native sultan, who lives at some distance from the shore, as his gods have forbidden him to look upon the sea (Lake Tanganyika). This is one of many curious native superstitions connected with the lake, several of which, collected by Mr. Stanley, embody traditions of its origin in a sudden catastrophe submerging an inhabited country. A stupendous water-filled chasm in the mountain system of Equatorial Africa, Lake Tanganyika has long offered problems to science, which the recent explorations of Mr. Thomson seem to have at last answered satisfactorily. The cause of the mysterious tide, under the influence of which it was seen to wax and wane through cycles of years, and the moot point of the escape of its waters into the Congo, through the marshy inlet known as the Lukuga Creek, had been, as our readers may remember, a subject of controversy between such distinguished explorers as Commander Cameron and Mr. Stanley. On the latter point, indeed, the careful survey made by the American traveller, in combination with the continued rise of the waters of the lake, was, as to the actual state of things then existing, conclusive in the negative. He, however, hazarded the bold conjecture, since proved correct, that this was but a temporary phase of the lake, and that the current of its out-flow, which had once run through the then stagnant and obstructed channel of the Lukuga, would do so again, as soon as the accumulation of water was sufficient to clear away the obstructions choking its mouth. This was what in point of fact occurred in the summer of 1879, when the lake suddenly burst through these impediments, scoured out its former channel, and discharged through it a volume of water sufficient to cause an inundation on the Congo, sweeping away trees and villages below its junction with that river.

Mr. Thomson believes this out-flow, which had sensibly diminished in the interval between his first and second visits, to be only periodical, and dependent on the amount of rainfall received by the lake, which is so closely hemmed in by high mountains as to drain a very limited district in proportion to its

vast area, and in exceptionally dry seasons to give off in evaporation as much as it receives. The rapid accumulation of soil and vegetation at the mouth of the Lukuga then forces up the level of the water, until after a series of wet years it breaks through the barrier once more. How this natural phenomenon was used to excite superstitious animosity to the French missionaries we shall see a little farther on.

After a voyage of exploration undertaken by Père Deniaud to select a favourable site for the Mission, Ujiji being unfitted for it both from its unhealthy situation and its subjection to Arab rule, Rumongué, in Urundi, some distance to the north, was finally decided on, and thither the Fathers migrated in June, 1879. They thus describe their situation.

Urundi presents one great advantage—it is healthier than Ujiji. There are tolerably high hills and mountains, and we have the air of the lake, which is very fresh. I am now completely recovered from the fatigues of the journey, and for more than a month have had no fever.

It is a pity that I have not the gift of poetry to describe our station. I write to you under the shade of a tufted tree on the slope of a hill, fifty mètres from the shore. Before us spread the peaceful waters of Tanganyika with a crowd of fishing boats. Farther away we can distinguish through a light haze the point of the great island of Muzima, and even the mountains of the opposite shore. To right and left, in every direction, extend well-cultivated fields of manioc, interspersed with bananas and oil palms; in the distance in our rear are lofty mountains with dwellings at their feet, but uninhabited, and often bare even to their lower slopes; the heat moderate, under 30 degrees within doors, and 24 to 25 without, thanks to a breeze from the lake.

The country is described as well cultivated, producing in abundance manioc, bananas, sweet potatoes, and beans. The construction of the Mission House went on apace.

Our house, or rather cabin, is completed; but how poor is our workmanship. It has but produced a shed, walled and thatched with straw, with one side left open to admit air and light. This side, which is 25 mètres in length, is closed at night by means of mats, which are lifted by day. The natives come from long distances, showing great admiration, and remaining long in contemplation of this monument of architecture. We have goats and sheep, and shall soon have cows. We are turning up the ground; and I, with a daring but inexperienced hand, am sowing large tracts with wheat and corn. Corn is only cultivated by two Arabs at Ujiji, and sold at a price which forbids its purchase, except for seed, and the use of the altar. The Arabs only sow their wheat at the approach of the dry season, and are obliged to irrigate it at great cost of labour. We have, therefore, tried another system.

But an object of much greater interest than our farming is the care of our ransomed children, and we have been fortunate in beginning our Mission with them. They are very promising, are most docile to all our desires, and have no serious faults. One danger is their running away, as happened in the case of a man and boy without any reason whatever.

But trouble came upon the little colony thus cheerfully toiling in the wilderness. In the month of December, 1879, their house was totally destroyed by a hurricane, and when they were about rebuilding it, the Sultan forbade the work and desired them to leave the country. Père Deniaud, who was then at Ujiji, applied to Muini Heri, the effective ruler of the whole district, and he sent his nephew, Bana-Mkombé, with the Superior, as an envoy to the Sultan. The latter, when asked the motive of his change of conduct, explained that he had been told by the Wajiji that the white men were sorcerers in possession of fatal poisons, and that they would drain off the lake through the Lukuga, by throwing medicines on the water, but that he had desired them to be expelled without the smallest injury to their persons or property.

Bana-Mkombé had no difficulty in refuting these reports, which doubtless arose from the sudden flushing of the Lukuga channel in the manner above described, coincidentally with the arrival of the Fathers. They were finally re-established on a more permanent footing, to the great joy of the natives, who considered them thenceforward as their friends, and executed a splendid war-dance in their honour.

Père Deniaud had on his way opened negotiations for the establishment of a second missionary station in the province of Massanzé, farther south, and promised the Sultan of that country to send him white men without delay.

But for these new operations reinforcements for the little missionary staff were required, and a second caravan was already on its way to join them, having started from Algiers in June, 1879. It was accompanied by six ex-Zouaves as lay-auxiliaries, according to the suggestion made by one of the first missionaries. Of the total of eighteen of which this fresh expedition consisted, only ten survived to reach their fellow-workmen at the Great Lakes, eight having died on the road—one, a lay-brother, mortally wounded in a combat with the Ruga-Rugas.

A third caravan, numbering fifteen missionaries, started last November to follow in their footsteps, and on the 8th of March, 1881, were establishing themselves at Mdaburu, about half-way from Lake Tanganyika to the sea. The Society of Algerian Missionaries has, in a word, in two years and a half, sent forty-three missionaries into Equatorial Africa, a number representing heroic efforts on the part of the little fraternity, but lamentably

insufficient in comparison with the vast field to be reaped. The districts of Lake Tanganyika, and the Victoria Nyanza have already been created Pro-Vicariates Apostolic, and it is designed to establish two new missionary centres, one in the territory of the Muata Yanvo, accessible from Ujiji, and another on the Northern Upper Congo, to be reached from the West Coast.

The reader who has followed the details of such a series of journeyings as we have essayed to describe, will scarcely require to be told of the immense cost involved in them, and will receive without surprise Mgr. Lavigerie's statistics on the subject. Every missionary established in the centre of Africa represents, he tells us, an outlay of thirty thousand francs, and within the last three years, on the mere foundation and creation of these missions, a sum of eight hundred thousand francs has been expended. The Protestant Missions are, indeed, still more costly, as they dispose of five millions sterling a year, and their liberal outlay at all stages of the journey was found by the Algerian Fathers to have largely increased the cost of travelling by the same road. Fortunately, the charity of Christendom is never exhausted in such a cause, but all its efforts are required to carry out so gigantic an enterprise.

It would seem that Mgr. Lavigerie's efforts for the evangelization of Africa were inspired equally by zeal for the spread of Gospel truth, and by horror at the cruelties of the slave-trade, some of the victims of which were occasionally met with in Algiers, and against whose iniquities he makes eloquent protest. He dwells at length on the revolting miseries inflicted on the slave caravans, and goes on to say :—

Amongst the young negroes torn by our efforts from these infernal tortures, there are some who for long periods afterwards awake every night uttering the most horrible cries. They see again in hideous nightmares the atrocious scenes they have gone through.

Four hundred thousand negroes are annually the victims of this scourge, and it is sometimes said that if the traveller following in its habitual track were to lose all other reckoning, he would find sufficient guide-posts to mark the path in the shape of the human bones blanching in decay.

The loyal exertions of Seyd Barghash have almost annihilated the export slave-trade from the East Coast, but for its continuance in the interior let the two following pictures from Mr. Thomson's pages speak :—

Half-way up the ascent a sad spectacle met our eyes—a chained gang of women and children. They were descending the rocks with the utmost difficulty, and picking their steps with great care, as, from the manner in which they were chained together, the fall of

one meant, not only the fall of many others, but probably actual strangulation or dislocation of the neck. The women, though thus chained with iron by the neck, were many of them carrying their children on their backs, besides heavy loads on their heads. Their faces and general appearance told of starvation and utmost hardship, and their naked bodies spoke with ghastly eloquence of the flesh-cutting-lash. Their dull despairing gaze expressed the loss of all hope of either life or liberty, and they looked like a band marching to the grave. Even the sight of an Englishman raised no hope in them; for unfortunately the white man has more the character of a ghoul than of a liberator of slaves in the far interior.

Saddest sight of all was that of a string of little children, torn from their home and playmates, wearily following the gang with bleeding, blistered feet, reduced to perfect skeletons by starvation, looking up with a piteous eye, as if they beseeched us to kill them. It was out of my power to attempt releasing them. The most I could do was to stop them, and give the little things the supply of beans and ground-nuts I usually carried in my pocket.

At a later stage of his journey he came upon another of these miserable spectacles.

Camped at Mtowa, we found a huge caravan of ivory and slaves from Manyema, awaiting, like ourselves, means of transport across lake (Tanganyika). There were about 1,000 slaves, all in the most miserable condition, living on roots and grasses, or whatever refuse and "garbage" they could pick up. The sight of these poor creatures was of the most painful character. They were moving about like skeletons covered with parchment, through which every bone in the body might be traced. . . . We learned that they had had a frightful march, during which two-thirds fell victims to famine, murder, and disease, so that out of about 3,000 slaves who started from Manyema only 1,000 reached Mtowa. . . . The poor wretches were carrying ivory to Ujiji and Unyanyembé, to be there disposed of, along with themselves, for stores to be taken back to Nyangwé.

Yet the writer describes the Arabs conducting these caravans as kindly and humane men in all other relations of life—surely the strongest proof of the brutalizing effect of such traffic on all engaged in it.

One might have expected that the sight of such scenes would have predisposed the youthful traveller to take a favourable view of the conduct of men whose very presence is a protest against them. Yet Mr. Thomson speaks of the Catholic missionaries in a tone of censorious acrimony, very different from that of most African explorers. On one occasion, in a village not far from Lake Tanganyika, he came on a party on their way to join the station in that district, and, making his way into their tent, unannounced and uninvited, while they were having such poor

repast as the circumstances admitted of, he took occasion to criticise all their arrangements, including their food. He speaks of them as "French peasants," severely condemning Père Deniaud for inducing them to leave their homes, apparently quite unaware of their character as missionaries. It is to be hoped Mr. Thomson may learn with more experience of life greater sympathy with the aims and motives of others, as it would be a pity if a spirit of intolerance and self-sufficiency were to mar the many fine qualities which enabled him to do his own work in Africa so creditably and well.

Ungenerous criticism of this kind is indeed in many quarters the only recognition bestowed on the Catholic missionary's labours in the cause of humanity, and the meed of human praise reaped by him is at best but small. The motives which sustain the ordinary traveller are in his case non-existent. His discoveries will evoke no applause from the learned, his adventures no sympathy from the multitude, his life's work will be obscure to the end, his name unknown, his death unchronicled. In the remote deserts where he has cast his lot scarce a word of appreciation from the world without ever reaches him to cheer the lonely hours when, amid the depressing influences of his surroundings, he seems to be labouring in vain; for European civilization, absorbed in the whirl of its own busy round, can spare no thought to those who by African lakes and streams are working at the noblest task possible to man here below—the moral regeneration of his fellow man.

CHICAGO

ART. VII.—A RECENT CONTRIBUTION TO ENGLISH HISTORY.

The History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain. By T. E. BRIDGETT. Two vols. C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.

HISTORY is no longer the simple narrative of facts that it used to be—*ad narrandum non ad probandum*; the exhibition of concurrent events just as they happened *en masse*, if we may so say; a panorama of the contemporaneous political and religious and social and domestic life of nations at a glance. The spirit of subdivision, characteristic of the times, has changed, completely changed, the old summary character of history. The keen analytical temper of the day has thrown men back on the past to scrutinize and mark off and draw out each constituent part, each separate feature of human society, in order to discover and to estimate at its true worth each

separate motive power in the development and growth of nations that has contributed to make them such as they are in the present. Buckle's "History of Civilization," Lecky's "History of European Morals," Freeman's "Historical Geography," each in its turn and measure is an example of this. Stubb's "Constitutional History of England" is a still better example. And the history that is before us, the "History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain" is the best example of all. It is the history of one single doctrine in its results on the individual life and the public character of the various races—Britons, Picts, Scot, Saxons, Anglo-Normans, English and Scotch—that during a period of more than a thousand years successively peopled this island and assisted the slow formation of the English nation.

I.

A more fitting title than the one adopted could not have been chosen for this work. And yet it is open to misconception. It is just possible that it will mislead people and give them an impression of something too doctrinal to be generally interesting, of something very abstract and learned and dogmatic, or controversial, or pious: more suitable for the study of theologians or the meditation of religious than for the general reading of ordinary laymen. This is just what it is not. It is learned, yes. There is something of dogma in it and something of controversy too. And moreover it is pious, since that may truly be called pious which, though marred by the record of much irreverence, is essentially a narrative of the piety of England in connection with the Blessed Sacrament, the *Mysterium Fidei*, the object of supreme adoration, during all the centuries that followed the adoption of Christianity by our forefathers down to the hour when the revolt of lust and greed and pride overthrew the altar of sacrifice and extinguished the lamp of the old Church throughout the length and breadth of the land. But so far from being a dry theological dissertation, a mere abstract, dogmatic, controversial treatment of the great central rite of the Catholic religion, it is, as we have already said, a history of the Holy Eucharist in its effects on the individual and public life of a nation; and it is so full of real personal interest, so full of varied biographical and historical incident; it sets forth in so fresh and striking a way the important civilizing, educating influence of the faith of the English people in the Eucharistic Presence, that it will enable many to see, who have never seen before, how singularly one-sided and incomplete that estimate of our national growth and development must be that, heedless of the operation of this particular belief in early times, overlooks the fact that the Holy

Eucharist was the origin and sanction of some of the great principles of our national prosperity, as well as a bond of union between the rulers who enunciated and upheld them and the ruled for whose benefit they were in the first instance chiefly established.

A few years ago it would have been impossible to produce such a history. The difficulties that stood in the way, great as they must have been now, would have been simply insurmountable then. And, indeed, notwithstanding the publication of the Rolls Series, of the Annals and Memorials and State Papers, of the Ecclesiastical and Conciliar Documents, of the critical studies of all the various antiquarian and archæological societies that have been laid under contribution for it, it is surprising that it has been possible even now. A moment's reflection will show why. The old Chroniclers were indifferent to every-day events. The routine of life, the *quidquid agunt homines*, had few attractions for them, little power to arrest their attention and claim a place in their records for future generations. Scandal itself—*Et quando uberior vitiorum copia?*—had a better chance of immortality at the hand of the scribe than a regularly recurring round of worship which everybody was bound to know and everybody was bound to practise.

Why should the annalist describe what everyone knew and daily witnessed? It would have seemed as natural to chronicle the daily rising of the sun and the effect of its rays upon the world. Indeed, there is a singular analogy between what is said of the weather and of the Blessed Sacrament. The annalists place on record how there was an earthquake throughout England in 1089, how a comet with two tails appeared in 1097, and mock suns in 1104; how at one time the Thames was almost dried up, and how at another it overflowed its banks; how thunder was heard on the feast of the Holy Innocents in 1249, while snow fell at the end of May in 1251. They tell of eclipses, murrains, severe winters, droughts, signs and portents. But they never describe the verdure of spring; the genial heat of summer, the fruitfulness of autumn; they never describe the full river flowing peacefully, or the midnight skies covered with brilliant stars. In the same way, if a church is burnt in an incursion of the enemy, if a murder is committed within the walls of the sanctuary, if the sacred vessels are stolen from the altar, if the holy rites cease during an interdict, such events are chronicled. But the daily service of the church, the fervent communions, the prayers poured out before the altar, the acts of faith and charity—all these, as a matter of course, are scarcely heeded.

Yet not for an instant must it be supposed that the "History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain" is unduly concerned with the dark side of the picture; that evil is more prominent than

good in it ; that irreligion and sacrilege perpetually cast their deep shadows across its pages. Abuses and crimes have their place, for the author does not suffer from 'the endemic perennial fidget about giving scandal,' and think that 'facts should be omitted in great histories, or glosses put upon memorable acts, because they are not edifying?*' But the sanctuary in which a murder was committed evidences something more enduring than the crime that profaned it ; the stolen vessels betoken something more general than the sacrilegious theft that desecrated them ; the interdicted rites witness to something more habitual than the disorders that led to their suspension. And it is just this something, the sustained faith of ages in its highest manifestations and noblest issues that Father Bridgett has mainly occupied himself with, till from the homes of the serf and the free-man, from the haunt of the wretched leper, from the quadrangle of the cottage, from the lecture-hall of the university, from the camp of the soldier, from the cell of the hermit and recluse, from the cloisters of the monastery and convent, from the courts of justice, from the legislative assemblies of the nation, from the council-chamber of the bishop, from the palace of the sovereign, he has brought a vast concourse of witnesses, men and women, bearing testimony to one all-pervading belief, which, penetrating the whole fabric of society, domestic, social, and political, ennobled life, stayed crime, and found a royal utterance in the Cathedrals and Abbeys that are still the wonder and glory of our land, and that—in spite of all the scientific knowledge of this age of discoveries, in spite of all our mechanical appliances, of all the skill of our artizans, of all the ceaseless industry of our operatives, unspoiled by the enforced idleness of Saints' days, so distressing to the enlightened, far-reaching wisdom of political economists—no architect can now approach in beauty of proportion and form, and no workman can surpass in strength and perfection of masonry.

II.

Beginning with the early British Church, we find the scant though clear proofs of a belief in the Real Presence identical with the belief of the Catholic Church at the present day, and consequently a belief utterly opposed to the tenets of Protestantism, gradually augmented by side lights from Brittany, and finally completed by the full radiance of the Gallo-Roman and Frankish Church, with which the Armorican Church was in close union, and which, in turn, the Armorican united to the sister Church of Great Britain and Ireland. This chapter, Side Lights from

* Card. Newman, "Historical Sketches."

Brittany, is a very important one, and is, besides, an admirable instance of the historical acumen of Father Bridgett and of the critical and constructive method employed throughout his book.

A few words of Tertullian's, written in 208, as many of Origin's, a few more of St. Jerome's, St. John Chrysostom's explicit statement that, 'even the British Isles have felt the power of the Word; for there, too, churches and altars (*ἑκκλησίαι*, a word of special significance, used as it is by St. John Chrysostom in the numberless passages of his works where he maintains the doctrines of the Real Presence and of Sacrifice) have been erected;' the fact that the Council of Arles, held in the year 314, at which canons were enacted, regarding the uniform observance of Easter according to the decision of the Bishop of Rome, the consecration of bishops, and the inviolability of the sacrament of marriage, was attended by the Bishops of York and London and Caerleon; a brief mention, here and there, by 'the ascetic and keenly religious' Gildas, of the most holy sacrifice, the heavenly sacrifice (*sacrosancta sacrificia, caeleste sacrificium*) called mass or missa, then as now, and one or two of his canons treating of the Eucharistic Rite, with special reference to the penances incurred by carelessness in the administration of it, together with his lament over the unworthy lives of certain of the clergy, "*raro sacrificantes et nunquam puro corde inter altaria stantes*," this is the sum of what we know expressly concerning the faith and practice of the British Church in relation to the Blessed Sacrament before the landing of St. Augustine in 597. Definite, unmistakeable, sufficient evidence, it is true, for those who know how to read it aright, yet really how scanty viewed apart from what it implies. But when we cross the water, and are landed on that little corner of territory, cut off by geographical position, as well as socially and politically isolated from the rest of Gaul, we are presented with a store of facts, which, though it has not been totally ignored hitherto, has, nevertheless, been so little heeded that modern historians have failed to realize that it belongs directly to the history of the Church in this country, and bears expressed on its beliefs and practices rarely more than implicitly or indirectly conveyed to us by the passing allusions of ancient historians.

That the Britons from Great Britain founded a small independent kingdom in Armorica a century before Clovis and his Franks passed the Rhine, is now, Father Bridgett, using the words of M. de Courson, the learned historian of ancient Brittany, says, as uncontested a fact as the existence of the sun in the heavens; though Breton writers, under Henry III. and Louis XIV., had to expiate in the Bastille their temerity in maintaining such a

proposition. From that time down to the invasion of Britain by the Saxons in the fifth century, there appears to have been a constant emigration of Britons to Gaul; and afterwards it increased to so great an extent that the whole body of the inhabitants of Western Armorica came to look upon themselves as British or of British origin. And the British emigrants of the fifth century did what Gaulish missionaries on the borders of Lower Brittany had failed to do. They covered Armorica and the islands round about the main-land with monastic and eremitical settlements, rescued by their preaching and example the original inhabitants from the idolatry of Druidism, converted them to Christianity; and so both rendered the fusion of the two peoples, alike in race and language, and differing only in religion, complete, and completed the establishment of the continental British Church.

Leaving aside the lives of the saints venerated in Brittany as involving disputes about dates and authenticity, Father Bridgett draws his facts concerning the religious practices of this off-shoot of the Mother Church in Great Britain from two principal sources, viz., Gallic Councils legislating for the British Church and contemporary Gallic writers.

The conciliar evidence is very remarkable and of the first importance. Keeping well in view the political and geographical isolation of the Britons in Gaul, analogous to the isolation of their brethren in Great Britain after the Saxon invasion, Father Bridgett advancing from council to council gradually unfolds an uninterrupted and growing intercommunion of the Gallic and British Churches, until at last we come to see that the detailed information which we possess regarding the Eucharistic Rite as celebrated in other parts of Gaul is applicable to Brittany and through Brittany to our own country, Great Britain, which kept up such close relations with the British Church of the emigration, united by ecclesiastical organization to the province of Tours, that two of its Churches, one at Canterbury in the south-east, the other at Withern in the north-west—the only two whose early dedications have come down to us—were dedicated to St. Martin of Tours. From the first Provincial Council of Tours, opened on the octave day of the Feast of St Martin in 461 under the presidency of St. Perpetuus, in which a British bishop took part, *Mansuetus episcopus Britanorum interfui et subscripsi*, on to the provincial synod held at Tours in 567, ecclesiastical legislative measures, canons and decrees were enacted regarding abuses amongst the clergy similar to those reprobated in unmeasured language by Gildas, which leave no doubt of the antiquity of the discipline of clerical celibacy and its close if not indissoluble connection with belief in the Real Presence.

For example, the first council named insists on the absolute necessity, not merely of conjugal chastity, but of virginal chastity, or at least of continence, for the ministers of the altar "who at all times must be ready with all purity to offer sacrifice." And although it so far mitigates the rigour of earlier councils as to admit to communion those who, having been married previous to their ordination, were unwilling to observe this discipline, it interdicted their admittance to the higher grades of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and forbid them the ministry of their respective functions. It must be borne in mind that Mansuetus, the bishop of the Britons, subscribed the canons of this Council, which are therefore a witness to the discipline of celibacy, and also to the motive of it, in Britain as well as in Gaul. The excommunication of Macliarus is perhaps a still stronger proof of the ordinance in Brittany. Macliarus was a British prince. After he had been tonsured and consecrated bishop, seeing a chance of succeeding to the throne, he let his hair grow, and took back his wife, from whom, on becoming a cleric, he had been separated. For this, according to St. Gregory, of Tours, he was excommunicated by the rest of the British bishops. Another council, held under the presidency of St. Perpetuus, at Vannes, in Brittany, accentuates the motive of the decrees of the Council of Tours enjoining celibacy four years previously; it forbids all deacons and sub-deacons from being present at marriage feasts and dances, then conducted with much indecency, "in order that they may not defile their eyes and ears consecrated for the sacred mysteries." And further, the synod assembled at Orleans in 511, and attended by Modestus, bishop of Vannes, marks the increasing and ever-watchful care to maintain due reverence for the "sacred mysteries" by its twenty-sixth canon, which forbids anyone to leave the church during the celebration of Mass. Then, whilst the attendance of two British bishops, St. Paternus, of Avranches, and St. Sampson, of Dol, at a council held in Paris, in 557, shows continued harmony between the two churches of Brittany and Gaul in the inter-communion of the saints of both countries, we find just ten years after at a provincial synod at Tours, the bishops of Tours and Rouen and Paris and Nantes and Chartres and Mans, and one or two others engaged on measures to stay the action of political causes at that time moving the Britons to seek independence of a see that had become Frankish territory, and at the same time lamenting bitterly the necessity that compelled them to renew the decree, obliging the clergy married previous to ordination, very numerous in those days, to live apart from their wives. "Who could have believed that a man who consecrates the Body of the Lord would be so wickedly bold had not such abuses arisen

in these last days as a punishment for our sins?" These strong words, Father Bridgett points out, "were not directed against concubinage, nor against attempts to marry after ordination—for there was no question at all on such matters—but against a continuance in a lawful marriage after the voluntary separation promised in ordination."

Conciliar evidence, however, though interesting and of great consequence, necessarily partakes of something of the abstract, dry character that inevitably attaches to legislative measures and enactments of the past dealing with classes and bodies of men; but scarcely are we conscious of it in this case before the whole subject is vivified by the personal narrative of the two contemporary authors who throw direct light on the Church of Brittany in early times, and we are carried away by the real interest of biographical incident. Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, the friend of St. Felix and the Secretary of Queen Radegund, writing an inscription to be engraved on a golden tabernacle or tower for the preservation of "the priceless pearl, the Sacred Body of the Lamb Divine;" poor Ursulfus suddenly regaining his sight while assisting at Mass one Sunday, *dum esset ad pedes Domini et cum reliquo populo missarum solemnia spectaret*, so that he could go up to the altar to receive communion without a guide, *ad sanctum altare communicandi gratiâ*; the cripple placed at the tomb of St. Martin cured on the feast of the saint, at the end of Mass, when the people began to receive the body of the Redeemer; men and women going into the Church at all hours and prostrating themselves in prayer before the high altar; the old woman trimming the lamps before nightfall; the priest Severinus decking his Church with garlands and lilies, and Queen Radegund with the Abbess Agatha wreathing Christ's altar with flowers at Easter-time; the solemn oath taken before the altar with the hand sketched over it, just as it was in Gildas's time; the obligation of the dominical Mass, and Severinus having said Mass at one church riding every Sunday twenty miles to celebrate a second; the widow attending daily the Mass she caused to be said for a whole year for her dead husband; the sermon of St. Cæsarius, bishop of Arles, rebuking the people for leaving the church before the sermon—some to go home, some to talk and laugh and quarrel outside—and urging them to wait till the mysteries are ended, since though they could have prayers said and the Scriptures read in their own houses, only in the Church could the oblations be made and the Body and Blood of Christ consecrated, *consecrationem vero corporis vel sanguinis Domini non alibi, nisi in Domo Dei, audire vel videre poteritis*; all this and much more besides gives an insight into the British Church such as was

hitherto deemed unattainable, whilst it utterly breaks down the theories of a pure British Church, untainted by the Romish corruptions of the invocation of saints and the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament; and reads like a chapter out of the history of the middle ages rather than one of those far-away-times best known through political historians as the dreary ages of barbarism with all their horrid accompaniment of bloodshed and lust and rapine.

III.

Unquestionably many of the apparitions and visions and miracles recorded of the first centuries of Christianity, are calculated to irritate and it may be shock, not only those who constitutionally lack the broad humanity of Terence, but those also, who more richly endowed have nevertheless been so narrowed by the bigotry of their bringing-up, and the cramping nature of their intellectual surroundings in after life, that they cannot give a patient consideration to anything so opposed to their preconceived notions of what ought to be, as that God should be able or willing to suspend the Laws of Nature at the prayer of one of his creatures. Such as these cannot fail to be arrested by the calm, philosophical spirit with which Father Bridgett, using, as he was bound to do, the important matter contained in what a less conscientious historian would have been specially tempted in these days to put aside or slur over as legendary uncertainties if not something worse, insists that, whether or not the miracles and visions of early historians be considered delusions or impostures, they are at least consonant with the customs of the period, and must be accepted as evidence of the belief of the times. And certainly no unbiassed judge could deny that incidents like that related by Adamnan of the youth of St. Columba 'may be fairly adduced as evidence of a state of mind amongst the Northern Picts, either arising from an habitual sense of God's omnipotence engendered by their belief in transubstantiation, or at least as a proof that such a doctrine could have met with little resistance on account of its intrinsic difficulties if for other reasons it was proposed for acceptance.'

But the history of the Holy Eucharist, in the Scottish and Pictish Churches, does not all run along the smooth lines of miracle. It has its stern side there as well as in the Church of Apostolic times. Another incident, preserved by the same Adamnan, discloses the repressive power of the Blessed Sacrament in its connection with the working of the penitential system. Libanus, an Irishman, slew a man and afterwards violated a solemn oath. He went over to Iona, made a full confession to

St. Columba, and swore that he was willing to fulfill any penance to atone for his sins. The Saint required him to live in exile, but in monastic service, for seven years, and at the end of that time to return to him during Lent, 'Ut in Paschali solemnitate altarium accedas et Eucharistiam sumas.' And this repressive power becomes more and more apparent the further we advance in the history before us: a power that often it has been impossible for those outside the Catholic Church to realize either because from having adopted a most unfortunate method of metaphorical interpretation, which plays havoc with the plainest words, they have utterly misunderstood the language concerning the central Rite of the Apostolic Church in all times and in all places, or else because they have deliberately shut their own eyes to its true meaning and veiled it for others who looked to them for guidance.

To those who share the conviction of Venerable Bede that the Catholic Church has never erred and never can err, because she is the Spouse of Christ and has received the Holy Ghost for her dowry, there is no need to prove that the early Church was one in faith regarding the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar with the Church of to-day, and for them it will be enough to know that the Scots and Picts were in communion of worship with the Anglo-Saxons, and both with the Church of Rome, to be sure that, when St. Gregory planned a new hierarchy for Great Britain in the sixth century, the same faith was preached, the same sacrifice offered, as when Pius IX. and Leo XIII. divided the island in the present century. Nor ought it to be difficult to convince any unprejudiced mind of this identity of faith by the identity of language on the subject of the Eucharist. A modern Catholic reading the "Life of St. Columba," written by Adamnan in 696, or the "Ecclesiastical History of England," written by Bede in 736, will find every formula familiar to himself, and expressing his faith exactly as well as adequately. Protestants, on the contrary, whether Calvinists, Zwinglians, Lutherans, or High Church Anglicans, are uneasy at such language, carefully avoid it themselves, and sometimes even distort or evade it when making quotations. To give one example. Bede relates that King Ethelbert gave St. Augustine the old church of St. Martin, and that "in this they began to meet, to chant psalms, to offer prayers, to celebrate masses (*missas facere*), to preach, and to baptize."* In relating this Carte says they preached and performed "other acts of devotion;" Collier that they "preached, baptised, and performed all the solemn offices of religion;" Churton that they "administered the sacraments."

Such vague expressions show well enough a want of sympathy with Bede even as regards so simple and venerable an expression as Mass. How much less then would Protestants use or understand the various periphrases so familiar to Bede and to all our early writers, as the

* Bede, i. 26.

celebration of the most sacred mysteries, the celestial and mysterious sacrifice, the offering of the Victim of salvation, the sacrifice of the Mediator, the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, the memorial of Christ's great passion, the renewal of the passion and death of the Lamb! All these expressions are used by Bede;* and for the Blessed Sacrament itself (as distinct from the rite of offering it to God)—besides the more common designations *Hostia* and *Sacrificium* (in the vernacular *Housel*)—they would speak of the saving Victim of the Lord's Body and Blood, the Victim without an equal, a particle of the sacrifice of the Lord's offering. These expressions are also found in Bede. Adamnan the Scot speaks of the sacrifice of mass, the sacrificial mystery, the mysteries of the most holy sacrifice; and he tells us of the priest at the altar who performs the mysteries of Christ, consecrates the mysteries of the Eucharist, celebrates the solemnities of masses.†

If we turn to the writings of Eddi, or St. Boniface, or St. Egbert, or to the decrees of early councils, we find the same or similar phrases, varied in every possible way to express a mystery, the sublimity of which was beyond human utterance. A multitude of verbs were in common use to designate the action of the priest at the altar. "*Missam cantare*" or "*canere*" might designate the whole action, though with special allusion to the vocal prayers. "*Missam facere*," "*offerre*," "*celebrare*," "*agere*," would also refer to the whole divine action; "*conficere*," "*immolare*," "*libare*," regarded the *Hostia*, or Victim, which was our Lord's Body and Blood or our Divine Lord Himself; and the secret operation by which the bread and wine were changed into our Lord's Body and Blood was indicated by every word by which transubstantiation can be expressed, among which we find "*transferre*," "*commutare*," "*transcribere*," "*transformare*," "*convertere*."

After this it is difficult to conceive that there are still Protestants who affirm that transubstantiation was unknown to the Anglo-Saxon Church, and was not introduced into England till the Norman Conquest, when by the influence of the two Italo-Norman primates, Lanfranc and Anselm, it supplanted the ancient and pure Protestant or quasi-Protestant doctrine that up to that date had prevailed. But this is not all. Declarations exist of Anglo-Saxon belief in a change of Substance so plain, so explicit, that there is no gainsaying them:—

* See Lingard, "*Anglo-Saxon Church*," i, ch. 7. The expressions will be found in his history and homilies: "*celebratis missarum solemnibus*" (iii. 5), "*victimam pro eo (defuncto) sacrae oblationis offerre*" (iv. 14), "*oblatio hostiae salutaris, sacrificium salutare*" (iv. 22), "*sacrificium Deo victimae salutaris offerre*" (iv. 28), "*corpus sacrosanctum et pretiosum agni sanguinem quo a peccatis redempti sumus denuo Deo in profectum nostrae salutis immolamus*."—*Hom. in Vig. Pasch.*

† "*Sacrificare mysterium*," "*sacrosancti sacrificii mysteria*," "*munda mysteria*," "*sacra Eucharistiae celebrare mysteria*," "*missarum solemnia peragere*," "*mysteria conficere*," etc.—*Vita S. Col.* ii., l. i. 40, 44, iii. 17.

Would any one, for instance, mistake the meaning of the following letter addressed to a Catholic priest? "I beg you will not forget your friend's name in your holy prayer. Store it up in one of the caskets of your memory, and bring it out in fitting time when you have consecrated bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ." Are not these words explicit? Well, they were indeed used in writing to a Catholic priest, but it was more than a thousand years ago, and he who used them was Alcuin,* the disciple of Bede. And Alcuin's scholar, Aimo, writing in A.D. 841, says,† "That the substance of the bread and wine, which are placed upon the altar, are made the Body and Blood of Christ, by the mysterious action of the priest and thanksgiving, God effecting this by his divine grace and secret power, it would be the most monstrous madness to doubt. We believe then, and faithfully confess and hold, that the substance of bread and wine, by the operation of divine power—the nature, I say, of bread and wine are substantially converted into another substance, that is, into Flesh and Blood. Surely it is not impossible to the omnipotence of Divine Wisdom to change natures once created into whatever it may choose, since when it pleased it created them from nothing. He who could make something out of nothing can find no difficulty in changing one thing to another. It is then the invisible Priest who converts visible creatures into the substance of His own Flesh and Blood by His secret power. In this which we call the Body and Blood of Christ, the taste and appearance of bread and wine remain, to remove all horror from those who receive, but the nature of the substances is altogether changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. The senses tell us one thing, faith tells us another. The senses can only tell what they perceive, but the intelligence tells us of the true Flesh and Blood of Christ, and faith confesses it."

I would observe that Aimo does not say that the senses are deceived; on the contrary, he says that they convey true messages to the mind—"sensus carnis nihil aliud renuntiare possunt quam sentiunt"—but that the mind would be deceived if it formed its usual judgment on their testimony. The senses tell us nothing about substance, the existence of which is known by reason. And reason judges rightly, as a general rule, that where the accidents of bread and wine appear, there is also the substance. But reason does not tell us that this is necessarily so. There is always this tacit exception—unless by God's omnipotence it is otherwise. And God's revelation tells us that in the case of the consecrated bread and wine it is otherwise; that the natural substance is not there, but is converted into (*transubstantiatur*) the substance of our Lord's Flesh and Blood.

Now it is obvious that so long as this language is ignored or

* Alcuin, *Ep.* 36, *ad Paulinum Patriarcham Aquilensem.*

† *Tractatus Aimonis*, apud D'Achery. *Spicileg.* t. i. p. 42, ed. 1723. The full Latin text is given by Dr. Rock, "Church of our Father," vol. i. p. 21, to whom I am indebted for this passage.

misunderstood or glossed over, the faith that it indicates is ignored likewise, and consequently the immense power that such a faith was in the world for restraining evil, coping with the wild passions of man in the wildest and most passionate of times, rousing the dormant intellect of a rude race, and bringing about the civilization of our country. The offering of the Mass was esteemed the characteristic and highest function of the priesthood; a man could not be ordained priest or deacon unless of approved life and properly instructed, and once ordained a priest he was obliged to live in perpetual celibacy. The Mass itself was the great centre round which the life of the nation revolved. The king was not crowned, the witan was not assembled, the battle was not fought, the church was not consecrated, the nuptial contract was not entered upon, the monk and nun were not professed, the Abbot or Abbess was not installed, the dead were not buried unless the blessing of God had first been sought in the Mass. If a crime were committed, the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice was suspended until the evil-doers had been brought to justice. St. Dunstan himself would not say Mass on Whitsunday until the terrible punishment, *i.e.*, the loss of a hand, had been executed on the false coiners:—

“They injure all classes, rich and poor alike, bringing them to shame, to poverty, or to utter ruin. Know then that I will not offer sacrifice to God until the sentence has been carried out. As the matter concerns me, if I neglect to appease God by the punishment of so great an evil, how can I hope that He will receive sacrifice from my hands? This may be thought cruel, but my intention is known to God. The tears, sighs, and groans of widows and orphans, and the complaints of the whole people, press on me and demand the correction of this evil. If I do not seek as far as in me lies to soothe their affliction, I both offend God who has compassion on their groans, and I embolden others to repeat the crime.”

How is it possible to over-estimate the repressive power of faith in the Real Presence, with such examples as this before us? Here was the prime minister of the king, the man who has left the progressive and constructive stamp of his mind on the laws of Edgar as well as on the ecclesiastical laws of the period,* refusing before all the people, on the solemn feast of Pentecost, to begin the Mass until justice had been satisfied and the course of evil stopped. And if it be denied that his sacrifice implied the full-orbed doctrine of the Real Presence upheld by the Catholic Church of to-day, we have only to turn to the beautiful account of the Saint's last Mass and death written by his contemporary, Adelard, for a refutation of the error:—

* “Memorials of St. Dunstan” (Rolls Series, 1874). *Introd.* pp. cv, cvi.

"On Ascension Day, 988," he says, "Dunstan preached as he had never preached before; and as his Master, when about to suffer, had spoken of peace and charity to His disciples, and had given His Flesh and Blood for their spiritual food, so too did Dunstan commend to God the Church which had been committed to him, raising it to heaven by his words, and absolving it from sin by his apostolic authority. And offering the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, he reconciled it to God. But before the Holy Communion, having given as usual the blessing to the people, he was touched by the Holy Ghost, and pronounced the form of benediction with unusual grace. Then having commended peace and charity to all, while they looked on him as on an angel of God, he exclaimed: 'Farewell for ever.'"

"The people were still listening eagerly to his voice and gazing lovingly on his face, when he returned to the holy altar to feed on his Life; and so, having refreshed himself with the Bread of Life, he completed this day with spiritual joy.

"But in that very day the column of God began to totter, and as his sickness increased he retired to his bed, in which the whole of the Friday and the Friday night, intent on celestial things, he strengthened all who came to visit him. On the morning of the Sabbath (*i.e.* the Saturday), when the matin song was now finished, he bids the holy congregation of the brethren come to him. To whom again commending his soul, he received from the heavenly table the viaticum of the sacraments of Christ, which had been celebrated in his presence, and, giving thanks to God for it, he began to sing: 'The merciful and gracious Lord hath made a memorial of His wonders, He hath given meat to them that fear Him.' And with these words in his mouth, rendering his spirit into his Maker's hands, he rested in peace. Oh! too happy whom the Lord has found watching!"

Faith in the Blessed Sacrament of the altar was moreover the real life of another chief factor of civilization among the Celts and Saxons. It was the keystone of the penitential system of the Church, without which, Father Bridgett says, the whole arch of the system would have crumbled to pieces:—

A second great principle of civilization among our Celtic and Saxon forefathers was the penitential discipline of the Church. This was for ages both the supplement and the support of the civil law, and was the principal means both of preventing crimes and of punishing malefactors. But if you take away the hope of receiving Holy Communion, you take away the keystone from the whole arch of this system, and it would have crumbled to pieces. The necessity of receiving the Body and Blood of the Lord on the one hand, the danger to the soul of doing this without the requisite purity on the other, could alone have induced men to undergo purifications so hard to human nature. And be it remarked that the Church, during this period, dealt not only with sin as an offence to God, but as a crime against society. Her discipline took the place, in a great measure, of civil penalties. While the Church punished crime by penance, the

State could leave the matter almost entirely in her hands. When the penitential system became less severe, civil penalties became more rigorous. Or we may perhaps say with equal truth—for in this matter there were mutual action and reaction—when the State, by advance in unity and organization, became competent to deal with crimes against itself, the Church willingly relaxed her penitential discipline, lest the same crimes should be twice punished. But certainly, during the period now under review, the chief agent in the repression and punishment of crime was the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, as giving life to the exhortations, admonitions, and maternal corrections of the Church.

And whenever men fell away altogether into bad courses, when vice and wrong-doing were rampant in the land, the old cry of Gildas, *raro sacrificantes*, was again heard. Neglect of Mass was the invariable accompaniment of broken vows, of luxury and intemperance: “*Male morigerate clerici, elatione et insolentia ac luxuria praeventi, adeo ut nonnulli eorum dedignarentur missas suo ordine celebrare, repudiantes uxores quas illicite duxerant, et alias accipientes, gulae et ebrietati jugiter dediti.*”

Equally remarkable with what we have called the repressive power of the Holy Eucharist is its creative power, its power of bringing forth positive good, and good not solely in the spiritual and moral order of things but also the temporal and political.

The Anglo-Saxon dominion spread the blight of slavery over England. Christianity met it by teaching the spiritual equality of all mankind redeemed by the Blood of Christ, and destroyed it by the practical results of such teaching. The serf and the lord knelt before the same altar, and both alike were privileged and bound to receive the same communion. On Sundays the master and the slave met in the same church to fulfil the same obligation, imposed without distinction on both, of being present at the Supreme act of worship, the Sacrifice of the Mass. On Sundays, the day consecrated in great measure by the dominical obligation, the bondsman could neither work for himself nor be compelled to work for his master; whilst at the great festival times of Christmas, Easter, and the Assumption, though the master could no longer enforce his usual right to the toil of his serf, the serf was free to labour for himself, and often earned sufficient not only to render his life less miserable, but even to purchase, in the course of time, his own freedom. If a master led his female slave into a breach of chastity, he was bound to give her freedom as well as to do six months penance himself. And of all the forms of emancipation obtaining in those days, that before the altar of the Church, “*sacrosancta altaria, sacrificii coelestis sedem,*” as it had been known from the days of Gildas, was the most frequent; almost all the existing records on the

subject are taken from the margins of Gospels or other books belonging to religious houses, and the few references in the laws imply emancipation at the altar. Once emancipation gained, no bar stood in the way of the humblest serf in the land aspiring to the priesthood, in the ranks of which the highest and the lowest classes met on a footing of absolute equality. And the sons of slaves, not of plebians only, were received into the companionship of Ninians, Wifrids, Egberts, Columbas, all members of royal houses or noble families. "The enslaved shall be freed, the plebians exalted, through the orders of the Church and by performing penitential service to God. For the Lord is accessible. He will not refuse any kind of man after belief, among either the free or plebian tribes; so likewise is the Church open for every person who goes under her rule." So ran the Brehon Laws, supporting a lofty democracy, a noble radicalism that will never be surpassed or equalled, though it be trampled upon and reviled by modern counterfeits that arrogate the name and usurp its place.

How far such teaching was at first opposed in Saxon times it would be hazardous to say; but it is a clearly established fact that having gained a footing it did not maintain its ground without a struggle against the spirit of the world in Norman times. Repeated attempts were made under our Norman kings to exclude slaves from the priesthood. One of the Constitutions of Clarendon, rejected by St. Thomas of Canterbury, as opposed to the rights of the Church, was that no serf's son could be admitted to holy orders. And the Church, in vindicating her own prerogatives, and upholding the rights of the poor and lowly in the reign of Richard II., was fronted with the prayer of the Commons to the king, "that no naif or villain shall place his children at school, as has been done so as to advance their children by means of the clerical state," and was opposed in the same spirit by some of the colleges of the universities who actually shut their gates in the face of the bondsman. Nevertheless the Church triumphed, and bishops' registers show that, down to the Reformation, emancipation previous to ordination was a common occurrence.

After all that has been said lately about oaths, their use and meaning and expediency, we follow with special interest their import and influence on the early life of the nation, bound up as they were with the most solemn and awful rites of religion. In the days of Howel the Good, when a judge was elected, he was taken to church by the king's chaplain, attended by twelve principal officers of the court, to hear Mass. At the end of Mass he had to swear by the relics, and by the altar, and by the consecrated elements placed upon the altar, that he would

never deliver a wrong judgment knowingly. Two centuries later we find that an oath was taken at Cirencester not only, *tactis sacrosanctis Evangeliiis*, but, *super sacramentum sanctum*. Earlier still than Howel the Good, the dooms of Ine, king of Wessex, ordained that greater weight should attach to the oath of communicants than to that of others. About the same time the Saxon laws of Wihtred required that, 'a priest clear himself by his sooth in his holy garment before the altar, thus saying, "I speak the truth in Christ, I lie not." In like manner a deacon. Let a clerk clear himself with four of his fellows, and he alone with his hand on the altar, let the others stand by; and so for the king's thane, the ceorl, and the stranger, and let the oath of all these be incontrovertible.' Hence belief in the Real Presence was one of the great safeguards of the integrity of an oath, whatever the occasion of it might be. It brought before the most careless, in a way there was no evading, a whole system of rewards and punishments present and future; it brought a man into the unseen world; it brought him face to face with the hidden God, *Deus absconditus*. And what is happening now that that faith is deliberately and explicitly spurned by the sovereign the moment a king or queen succeeds to the sway of this Empire? Disbelief in the necessity of veracity, disbelief in the sanctity of the oath, disbelief in the existence of God Himself, is following surely, if slowly, step by step. And whereas formerly the oath of a clerk, or thane, or ceorl, or stranger, taken with his hand resting on the altar was incontrovertible, now, no sooner has a witness been brought into court and sworn, as it is called, 'than he is treated by the opposing barrister as if he had come purposely to perjure his soul and to confound justice.'

IV.

The exultant prologue of the old Salic Law reaches the crowning point of the glories of the Frankish people when it proclaims their freedom from heresy. All their beauty and boldness and bravery are but as so many steps leading up to this, '*ad catholica fide nuper conversa et immunis ab herese*.*' It is noteworthy that the Church of the kindred Teutonic race that conquered Britain, the Anglo-Saxon Church, could boast of precisely the same characteristic freedom from heresy. So that when Lanfranc, the first archbishop of Canterbury of Norman appointment, left the field of his encounters with the shifty, scoffing, sharp-tongued Berengarius, in the very heat of the

* "*Lex Salica*." Prologus. Ed. Merkel.

controversy, and assumed the government of the English Church, he—the acute and profound defender of the Real Presence, who had unswervingly affirmed the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the clearest and most precise terms in France—though his rule was not without severity, though he deposed bishops and abbots, though he did not spare the ignorance of the islanders he had come amongst, could bring no charge of heresy against his new flock. The Norman invasion was so totally different from the invasions of the Saxons and Danes because the new conquerors were one in faith with the vanquished nation. The English, monks and laity, hated their victors. The Church of Glastonbury was the scene of sacrilege and bloodshed, originating in a feud between the Norman Abbot and the Saxon Monks. But the cause of the feud was no matter of doctrine, simply the monks would not abandon their Gregorian chant. If the victors, full of the controversy that was raging in the land they had just quitted, had attempted to impose on the Anglo-Saxon Church a novel faith, as over and over again it has been asserted they did, history would have been full of the fierce resentment that springs from the jealousy of religious innovation. As it is not a single favourer of the Berengarian heresy is mentioned in English History.

With the gradual quieting down of the country after the Conquest, and the amalgamation of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman people, the Cathedrals and Abbeys and parish Churches of the Anglo-Norman Church gradually rose and covered the land. And in the thirteenth century so great was the zeal for splendid buildings in which to celebrate the Divine Mysteries, that the Council of London presided over by the Pope's legate, Otho, in 1237, decreed that 'Abbots and rectors must not pull down old churches in order to build better ones without leave of the bishop, who will judge of the necessity or expediency.' The same Council enjoined that all churches were to be consecrated 'because in them the Heavenly Victim, living and true, namely, the only begotten Son of God, is offered on the altar of God for us by the hands of the priest.' Princes, prelates and people vied with one another in their zeal for the glory and beauty of God's House. Everything that was richest and most costly was committed to the guardianship of the bishop or abbot for the Church. As Eadfrid, the fifth Abbot of St. Alban's, in the time of King Edmund the Pious, had manifested his faith in the Eucharistic Presence by the offering of a beautiful vessel, *cyphum desiderabilem*, for the Blessed Sacrament, so Robert, the eighteenth Abbot, who died in 1166, marked his belief by the gift of a precious vessel under a silver crown; and his successor, Simon, caused to be made by Brother Baldwin, the goldsmith, a vessel

'most admirable of pure red gold with gems of inestimable value set about it,' which King Henry II. hearing of, 'gratefully and devoutly sent to St. Albans a most noble and precious cup in which the shrine *theca*, immediately containing the Body of Christ, should be placed.' Eustace of Ely, one of the three bishops who published the great interdict in the reign of John, gave to his Church a gold pyx for the Eucharist. Eustace, Abbot of Flay, who was sent to England in 1200 by the Pope, frequently admonished priests and people that a light should be kept burning continually before the Eucharist in order that He who enlightens every man who cometh into this world might for this temporal light grant them the eternal light of glory. William Stedman 'settled a wax taper to burn continually day and night for ever before the Body of our Lord in the chancel of the Church of St. Peter, of Mancroft, Norwich.' And this daily, hourly reverence for the Blessed Sacrament, Father Bridgett traces in the munificence of our ancestors down through the centuries, in examples drawn from chronicles and wills of generation after generation, till we come to what indeed is the most touching of all: the will of Agnes Badgeroft, a Benedictine nun. The poor creature was driven from her religious home, the dissolved Abbey of St Mary's, Winton, by the tyranny of Henry. Yet she was loyal to the end to her vows and her faith. And when she died in Mary's reign, by her will, June 30, 1536, she bequeathed "my professed ring to the Blessed Sacrament for to be sold and to buy a canopy for the Blessed Sacrament in the Church of St. Peter's, Colbroke."

Living in the midst of all the multitudinous religious discords of the present day, breathing whether we will or no the very atmosphere of theological dissension and strife, it is exceedingly difficult to seize the full meaning of Father Bridgett's picture of the Anglo-Norman Church, though it is worked out to the very least detail of its outward manifestation in material magnificence and of its moral aspect in the spiritual life of the people. Yet unless we do fully compass it, it is scarcely too much to say that we can have no real insight into one of the greatest events of the time, the famous interdict of Pope Innocent III. The picture of the Anglo-Norman Church brings into view a mighty nation bound together in perfect concord by the strong tie of religious unity. It is a complete exemplification of the unitive power of the Holy Eucharist. It introduces us to a whole people brought together on an equal footing in one great act of faith and worship which was at once their highest privilege and their gravest obligation; the first care of their daily life, their hope in death, and a bond of union with those that had left them for another world. Richard I. in his better days used to rise early and seek first the kingdom

of God, never leaving the church until all the offices were ended. William the Conqueror heard Mass daily, and assisted at matins and vespers and other Canonical hours; and when dying he had at his own request been taken to the Priory of St. Gervase, with floods of tears for the terrible destruction of Mantes and his previous barbarities in Northumberland, he begged that he might receive Holy Communion from the hands of the Archbishop of Rouen. When St. David, King of Scotland, felt that his end was approaching, he had himself carried by the clergy and soldiers into his oratory to receive for the last time the most holy mysteries before the altar. Henry III., according to Walsingham, was wont "every day to hear three Masses with music (*cum notâ*), and not satisfied with that, was present at many low masses besides; and when the priest elevated the Lord's Body, he used to support the priest's hand and kiss it. It happened one day that he was conversing on such matters with St. Louis, King of the French, when the latter said that it was better not always to hear Masses, but to go often to sermons. To whom the English king pleasantly replied that 'he would rather see his friend frequently than hear another talking of him however well.' Henry's son, Edward I., was so distressed at the neglect of Mass by his daughter, after her marriage with John of Brabant, that he caused large alms to be made to atone for it. And the neglect and the atonement are thus handed down to us in the wardrobe book of the year: 'Sunday, the ninth day before the translation of the virgin (*i.e.*, the Assumption), paid to Henry, the almoner, for feeding 300 poor men, at the King's Common, because the Lady Margaret, the King's daughter, and John of Brabant, did *not* hear Mass, 36s. 7d.,' a sum equal to £27 of our money; and besides this John of Brabant was obliged by his father-in-law to give an additional sum in alms. The renowned Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste, had to cope with grave abuses, not because the nobles neglected Mass, but because they insisted on having it said privately for the benefit of their own households, a privilege accorded solely to royalty. Henry of Estria, Prior of Canterbury, who died in 1330, having been prior for forty-seven years, 'at last in his ninety-second year, during the celebration of Mass, after the elevation of the Lord's Body, on the 6th of the ides of April, ended his life in peace.' St. Ælred, Abbot of Rievaulx, for ten years grievously afflicted with bodily infirmities, fought against them so long as he could stand in order to say Mass, though for the last year of his life after the daily effort, exhausted, he would lie for an hour on his bed, motionless and speechless. Then when Edward I. wrote to the Archbishop of York to announce the death of Queen Eleanor and beg for prayers and Masses, 'that as she herself could no longer merit,

P
H
H

she might be helped by the charitable prayers of others,' the Archbishop wrote to the King that the number of Masses he had ordered to be offered for the Queen's soul in the parish churches and chapels where there were priests celebrating amounted to 47,528; and that he had also granted forty days' indulgence to all who said a *Pater* and an *Ave* for the repose of her soul. As the Masses were to be said every Wednesday for the space of one year, and would amount to 47,528, a simple calculation reveals that at the end of the thirteenth century the number of priests in the archdiocese of York alone was no less than 914. And finally, to put a limit to proofs that might be multiplied almost endlessly, the example of William of Kilkenny, Bishop of Ely, who left two hundred marks to his church to find two chaplains to celebrate perpetually for his soul, shows that those who were continually besought to supplicate for the souls of others were careful to provide against the neglect of their own.

Now the interdict of Innocent III. means the arrest of the whole of this part of the common life of England for more than six years. The threat of it startled even the shameless King, who brought it upon the country, and he vowed that if it were published he would banish the clergy from the land, mutilate every Italian in the realm he could lay hands on, and confiscate the property of every man who should obey it. But the interdict was published, and correcting the inaccuracies of Mr. Green's account of it, and supplying what was wanting to the brevity of Dr. Lingard's, Father Bridgett gives us a view of its effects such as no historian has succeeded in doing before.

The interdict of Innocent III. was no ordinary interdict—if a measure so exceptional can ever in any sense be rightly termed ordinary. It surpassed in the severity of its clearly-defined prescriptions all those of a later date. From the 23rd of March, 1208, Mass ceased, the altars were stripped and the churches were closed throughout the land; espousals could not be contracted nor marriages celebrated; infants were to be baptized, but only at home; the dying might make their confession, but they could not receive the Eucharist or Extreme Unction; the dead could not be buried in consecrated ground; friends might lay them wherever they pleased outside the churchyards, especially where passers-by would be moved by the sight, but no priest could be present at the burial; the bodies of the clergy, inclosed in sealed coffins or in lead, might be placed in the trees of the churchyard or on its walls, but even bishops themselves who died during the interdict, so long as it lasted, remained unburied.

When it came to the Pope's hearing that some of the Cistercians, not considering themselves comprised in the general terms of the interdict—their special privileges requiring a particular mention

*Population must have been much greater
than now imagined etc.*

of them to be made—had begun to say Mass, Innocent, without blaming the monks, charged the bishops to determine whether this partial non-observance was likely to cause scandal, or to make the King think that he, the Pope, would relent if John persisted in his contumacy. If it were calculated to do so, they were to restrict at once the liberty claimed by these religious.

In January, 1209, Cardinal Langton sought and obtained permission for Mass to be celebrated once a week secretly in all the conventual churches, where up to that time the interdict had been obeyed, in order 'that the virtue of this most Divine Sacrament may obtain a good end to this business.' Permission was also granted to the Cardinal and to the three Bishops of London, Ely and Worcester to have Mass said for themselves and their households should they be summoned to England by the King. But a further entreaty of the Cistercians for something more than the general concession to monastic orders of a weekly Mass was firmly, though kindly, refused. They urged every argument likely to avail, Innocent's own, for the concession he had already made, included. But the Pope remained fixed in his refusal. 'Although,' he wrote, 'you very piously believe that the immolation of the Saving Victim will bring about more speedily the desired ending to this business, yet we hope that if you bear patiently this undeserved pain, "the Spirit who asketh for you with unspeakable groanings," will all the more quickly obtain a happy issue from Him, who by bearing a pain not due, and by paying what he had not taken, hath redeemed us, even our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore we pray and beseech you, beloved sons, that remembering that this affair is now almost at its end, you will not disturb its progress, but that you will well weigh what we have written for God's sake and for ours, who with a most fervent charity are zealous for you and your order, and who hold it in veneration; and that bearing your present troubles in patience you will give yourselves to prayer to God that He would so soften the author of this guilt as to absolve those who bear the pain; and be certain that, for the undeserved pain you bear, a worthy recompense is in store for you, not only from God but from us also.'

History as a rule is so busy with the turbulent doings of the barons, and so intent on the conduct of the great personages of the struggle, that we lose sight of the multitude of Religious, and of the bulk of the people and secular clergy cut off from everything that made life worth living to them. Such words as 'the disgrace and horrors of the interdict' fall upon almost deaf ears, so vague and abstract have the circumstances and the spirit of our own times rendered them. Sermons in Music Halls, if Music Halls had been in those days, though delivered by the

most eloquent or popular preacher, would never have compensated for the loss of Mass to the poorest congregation of mediæval England. It is just this view of the matter that Father Bridgett's account of the interdict supplies. Together with the increasing restlessness of the religious orders under its gloomy restrictions, we feel the secret disaffection that was spreading amongst the people, when, contrary to all the expectations of the Pope, John—envying Mahommedan nations who knew no restrictions of morality, and had no Pope to vindicate God's rights and the rights of God's people—so far from yielding, hardened himself more and more against God and man; gave himself up to every kind of brutal indulgence; is said to have even sought help from the Emperor of Morrocco with an offer of renouncing Christianity; pillaged churches and confiscated the goods of the churchmen who resisted him; and carried his impious defiance of interdict and excommunication alike to such lengths that when he chanced to see a very fat stag brought in, he cried out with a laugh, 'He had a good life, and yet he never heard Mass.' No wonder that the terrible verdict of the King's contemporaries—'Foul as it is, hell itself is defiled by the fouler presence of John'—has passed into the sober judgment of history.*

Dr. Lingard, with certainly less than his usual perspicacity, esteems the interdict 'a singular form of punishment by which the person of the King was spared, and his subjects, the unoffending parties, were made to suffer.' Father Bridgett shows a wider grasp of the subject. He has appreciated and exhibits the fact that, though far less guilty than the King, England as a nation was at the time far from innocent:

'A mediæval monarch, however despotic, could not be considered apart from his people, as if they bore none of the responsibility of his acts. When it suited their own interests the barons could be bold enough both to counsel and to resist their sovereigns. The feudal system put no standing army in the pay and obedience of the King. It left him dependent on the fidelity of his great vassals. If kings were bold to do evil, it was because they were pushed on by evil counsellors among the clergy and the laity, were surrounded by docile agents, and counted on the co-operation or connivance of their people. What were the great excommunications and interdicts of the Middle Ages but lessons in constitutional government given to kings and people alike, teaching them that they were responsible to and for each other? If the innocent suffered with the guilty, that is the very condition of human society.'

* J. R. Green, "History of the English People."

And then more pointedly justifying the Pope for an act that has been variously misrepresented and misinterpreted as part of a crafty or ambitious policy, difficult of vindication on the grounds of either equity or justice, he sums up this section of his subject :

‘The crimes of the country attained their climax in John, one of the vilest of our kings ; and there was no injustice in requiring the whole nation to unite in expiating his guilt.

‘Besides this, if we would form a right conception of the great interdict of 1208, we must remember that an interdict is not an ordinary punishment of ordinary crimes. It is a solemn protest against outrages to the liberty and majesty of the Church. She is established by God as the Queen of the nations as well as their mother. She has a right to hide her countenance when she is insulted. She had a right to demand reparation. Pope Innocent exercised no tyranny. He withdrew from the English nation nothing to which it had a right. He confiscated none of its riches, he abridged none of its liberties. It was as a supernatural society, as a baptized people, as a part of the Church of which he under Christ was supreme ruler, that he humbled the nation, or called upon it to humble itself, by the withdrawal of God’s presence. He judged it better that the Churches should be closed even for years than that they should be opened for the pompous but sacrilegious ministrations of the enslaved and corrupted priesthood which John would have created. It was better, as he wrote to the Cistercian Abbots, that the Holy Spirit should, with ineffable groans, plead in the hearts of desolate men, than that Masses should be offered in the presence of impenitent sinners.

‘The obstinacy of the King, and perhaps the sins of the nation, made the interdict far longer than the Pope had anticipated. He had hoped that a short vigil would be followed by a glad festival. It was not his fault if the vigil was of unexampled length. It was a war, and partook of a war’s chances. Innocent chose it, it would seem, as a milder measure than excommunication.

‘Having once entered upon it he had no choice but to fight it out to victory, even though the victory could not be gained without a far more terrible and prolonged contest than he had expected, and though he was obliged to add at least those other spiritual penalties from which he had shrunk at first.

‘The interdict lasted six years and three months ; for though the King had been absolved from his excommunication, and High Mass and Te Deum were sung in the Cathedral of Winchester on the 20th July, 1213, yet reparation was not made by him, nor the interdict removed from the country, until July 2nd, 1214,

"Et factum est gaudium magnum in universa Ecclesia Anglicana." *

V.

Clearly the interdict derived its unconquerable operative power from the faith of the people, not from the faith of the Sovereign, and it was a faith that, as we observed just now, had never been breathed upon much less shaken by the wind of heresy. William of Newborough, writing at the end of the twelfth century, rejoiced that England had ever remained free from every heretical pestilence though many other parts of the world were afflicted by various forms of its disturbing presence. "The Britons indeed," he wrote, "produced Pelagius, and were corrupted by his doctrine. But since Britain has been called England no contagion of heresy has ever infected it." And for nearly two centuries after William of Newborough wrote, England remained free. And even when the metaphysical subtleties of Wycliffe and the frenzy of the Lollards against the Holy Eucharist first made its dreadful disintegrating power felt, heresy had no wide-spread influence, it did not exert a national influence. Great as the mischief it did was, it could not alienate the masses from their old faith.

'Ten years after the death of Wycliffe the fanaticism of the Lollards emboldened them to present a petition to Parliament, which, though then rejected, is remarkable as being the first mention in that assembly of a heresy which was, in the course of centuries, to be adopted by it as a test of the allegiance to the Crown and Protestant Church. "The false Sacrament of Bread," says this petition, "leads all men, with a few exceptions, into idolatry; for they think that the Body of Christ, which is never out of heaven, is, by virtue of the priest's words, essentially enclosed in a little bread which they show to the people." †

'There was much corruption of morals, much scepticism in England, at that time among the higher classes, much misery and ignorance in the lower orders, yet the nation was not yet prepared to reject the faith of centuries and cut itself off from Christendom. There was a sturdy common-sense view which prevailed over the metaphysical subtleties of Wycliffe and which is thus exposed by Netter: "Are then all infidels who are not Wycliffites? All—Greeks, Illyrians, Spaniards, French, Indians, Hungarians, Danes, Germans, Italians, Poles, Lithuanians, English, Irish, Scotch—all the innumerable priests and bishops throughout the world all blind, all infidels? And has the whole Church throughout the world now at length to learn from this

* Thomas Wykes, p. 58, Rolls Series.

† Wilkins, iii. 221.

John Wicked-life* what Christ meant in the Gospel when he gave His Body in the Eucharist? And did Christ thus leave His spouse, the Church of the whole world, deprived of the possession of the true faith, in order to cleave to this Wycliffian harlot? Surely the portentous ambition of this new sect is alone deserving of eternal punishment. You wretched, deluded men, does it really seem to you a trifle to believe in Christ as you profess to do, and to disbelieve in His Church? To believe in Christ the Head and to sever from Him His mystic body? To begin the creed with, I believe in God, and to terminate your counter-creed with, I deny the Catholic Church?"†

Granted that the Lollard negations prepared the way for 'the wider and ever-widening negatives called by the general name of Protestantism,' that they did not take real hold of the masses is abundantly proved in many a chapter of the History of the Holy Eucharist, embracing the generations that came and went before the Reformation 'was forced on an unwilling people.' And to show that they did not affect the choice specimens of human wisdom and virtue, we have only to recall the names of men and women like Robert Grosseteste, the upholder of our national liberties; William of Wykeham, the illustrious Bishop of Winchester; Elphinstone of Aberdeen, churchman, lawyer, and statesman; Margaret, Countess of Richmond and Derby, mother of Henry VII. and founder of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; John Fisher, the great patron of learning, Bishop and Cardinal; Thomas More, Chancellor of England and martyr.

John's character and acts proved 'that what is called the Reformation—that is to say, the perpetual and self-imposed interdict of the Catholic religion in England—might have come some centuries earlier than it did had it only depended on the will of kings. Such men as Rufus and John were quite as willing as Henry VIII. to sacrifice the souls of their people to the gratification of their own avarice, lust, and hate. Remedies such as that made use of by Innocent were possible in the thirteenth century, but would have been found useless in the sixteenth. They depend for their efficacy on the strength of faith, not merely in one country, but throughout Christendom. When a great number have come to be of the opinion of John, that temporal prosperity is more important than religion, and boast how well a country can get on without Mass—like John's fat buck—then it would be an idle threat to deprive them of what they already disregard.'

* "A Joanne, cognomento impiæ vitæ." If my translation is correct, this pun on Wycliffe's name must have been well known in England, since the Latin would convey no meaning to any but an Englishman.

† Thomas Netter (Waldensis), "Doctrinale Fidei," iii. 35.

How in the sixteenth century so great a number came to be of the opinion of John as to bring about the tremendous revolution that made the national faith of centuries a penal offence Father Bridgett does not tell us. Passages such as the one last cited foreshadow and anticipate the momentous epoch in the History of the Holy Eucharist when the doctrine of the Real Presence was reviled as a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit, when the offering of Mass by a Catholic priest was punished with a cruel death, and the repudiation of it was required as the price of social preferment or of civil liberty; but that is all. The volumes we have been rapidly glancing through bring us down to the Reformation, and there they stop. Happily the reason is not far to seek, nor disconcerting when found. In a notice prefixed to the first volume the author tells us that he had collected materials to complete his History to the present day; but when he found that a third volume would be required to treat adequately the Reformation and post-Reformation periods, he thought it better to make the early and mediæval periods complete in themselves, and he has done so. And moreover he promises the third volume. It cannot well be more important than the two volumes before us. But if we have not shown that it will be of very great importance as the completion of a work that has hitherto been wanting to the popular apprehension of our national history, we have gravely failed in our duty.

ART. VIII.—ON SOME REASONS FOR NOT
DESPAIRING OF A NATIONAL RETURN TO
THE FAITH.

[This Paper was read by the writer before the Academia of the Catholic Religion.]

A MOST able and thoughtful Paper on the conversion of England, which was read by an Academician at the last session in June last, elicited from several members, including the present writer, the expression of an opinion more favourable to our wishes than that to which he inclined. The accomplished author of that Paper appeared to believe that, whereas there were many signs of a growing tendency on the part of individuals, alarmed at the swift and wide-spread movement of this age and country towards disbelief in all and every form of supernatural religion, to fall back on the Catholic Church as the alone adequately tutelary system of historic and doctrinal Christianity, yet anything like

a *national* return to the faith of our fathers seemed hardly to be possible. It is with the hope of being able to marshal a few facts and draw from them some inferences less unfavourable to our wishes, that I make the following remarks, which I trust may serve as topics on which we may have the advantage of reading others more competent to treat of such matters.

1. My first topic in mitigation of the less hopeful view is a historic consideration to which in the ardour of controversy we may perhaps have not been quite fair. I mean the fact that the first lapse of the national establishment of religion under Queen Elizabeth was the worst. The tone of the Anglican formularies and that of their defenders since that lapse has been on the whole an improving tone. Compare the uniform downward tendency of the other separatists of the sixteenth century in this and in other lands with that of the Established religion, and you will see a marked contrast. "Lutherans," says John Henry Newman, "have tended to rationalism; Calvinists have become Socinians; but what has it become? As far as its formularies are concerned, it may be said all along to have grown towards a more perfect Catholicism than that with which it started at the time of its estrangement; every act, every crisis which marks its course, has been upwards. It never was in so miserable case as in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. At the end of Elizabeth's there was a conspicuous revival of the true doctrine."* It is true that these are the words of an illustrious writer who was at that time an Anglican; but I think the facts are as he states, however differently we, and no doubt he himself now, would estimate their value and importance. I also conceive him to be speaking, as I do now myself, of Anglicanism in the restricted official sense of the term. Similarly, what a vast improvement in the doctrine and tone of the "Caroline" Divines over those of the so-called Reformation! and though the storms of the great rebellion for a time swept all before them, these were more akin to an external persecution, affecting rather the outward conditions of the establishment of religion than its inward and spiritual character. In the next century, again, the Socinian elements in the Protestant Church may be fairly said to have been checked, if not eliminated, by her own action; and the eighteenth century will figure in the minds of orthodox Anglicans, nay, of fair-minded historians, rather as that of Butler, and Wilson, and Horne, than as that of Tillotson, Warburton, Newton, Hoadley, and their successors and imitators. The undisturbed Erastianism of the last age, again, has in its turn gradually given way to the higher conception of the

* J. H. Newman, *Catholicity of the English Church*: "Hist. and Crit. Essays," vol. ii. p. 55.

Church and her office which is now current among Anglicans. If, for instance, we compare an assize sermon preached at the beginning of this century by a very able and excellent man, whose name and principal work is still familiar to elderly Oxonians, Mr. Davison, some time Fellow of Oriel, with such compositions at the present day, we shall see what a great advance has been made in the interval of some sixty or seventy years. In the discourse alluded to, the preacher, speaking of the importance of some public authoritative instrument for teaching and impressing, warning, or fortifying the public mind, never once directly or indirectly alludes to the Church as a divine, or even as a human, institution directed to this end; but speaks of human and civil law as their "most certain instruction," as furnishing them with "at least some stock of ideas of duty," and as their "plainest rule of action." I have said not even *indirectly* does he allude to the Church, but this is incorrect; for I find in the same passage (by Newman in his article on Davison) the following fine apostrophe: "As if the Mother of Saints were dead or banished, a thing of past times or other countries, he actually applies to the law of the land language which *she* had introduced, figures of which *she* exemplified the reality, and speaks of the law as 'laying crime under the *interdict* and infamy of a public condemnation.'" (*Ib.*, p. 409). Lastly, let me remind you that whereas in the first age of Anglican Protestantism the universal and unchallenged belief in the real absence of our Lord on her altars was fitly symbolized by the sordid table and side-benches placed lengthways in the body of the churches, now I believe I am right in saying that, with scarce an exception, and irrespective of the parties and their shades of belief, or unbelief, which divide the Anglican Establishment, all Anglican Churches contain a communion-table placed altarwise, and, in a very large number of instances, intended and contrived to look more or less like a real altar. If we assume this fact to have but a slender, or even no, dogmatic significance, still the fact remains, and, like other facts, has to be accounted for. I believe that the origin of the upward tendency in this as in other particulars is distinctly to be traced in the Anglican canons of 1603, and again in those of 1661.

2. Next I will remark on the distinct increase of religious practice which characterizes this latter half of the nineteenth century. I remember that one of the broad issues which challenged my attention when first, some forty years ago, I began to think of the religious question, was the palpable fact that, whatever might be the alleged superior purity of Protestant doctrine over that which it supplanted, in point of religious practice there was no question the so-called Reformation was a vast decline from the ante-Reformation standard. The mere fact

that the pre-Reformation churches were always open, on feast day and on feria, that the services succeeded each other from early dawn till noon-tide, and that they were attended by crowds of people of all ranks and conditions, whereas after the religious revolution the churches remained shut, the great service which brought men to them was abolished, and the times seemed to have come on this land which God foretold by the mouth of His prophet when all his solemnities and festival times should cease,* this mere fact is a *prima facie* condemnation of the whole so-called reformation of religion. Well, whatever stress we justly lay on it, we must in equity proportionately mitigate when, as at the present time, we see a vast number of churches once more opened and frequented, and a most remarkable increase of services, so as in some places to imitate the Catholic use of churches in the repetition at frequent intervals of the Holy Mass; nor only so, but the services thus repeated are specially those in which that dim and shattered image of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which the so-called Reformers substituted for it, is repeated, as if in emphatic repudiation of the Anglican article, which denounces the reiteration of the Mass as an abuse to be by all means and for ever done away. Moreover, not only has an extraordinary revival of church services and church frequentation and observance characterized this time, but the ritual, as we all know, has undergone such a change in the Catholic direction as would have simply astounded our immediate progenitors if, as is the case in rare instances still, they had survived to behold the change. Even in my own recollection the service and ritual of the Anglican Church throughout the land has undergone an astonishing revolution. Instead of a huge pile of woodwork often entirely obscuring the squalid communion-table and its deserted septum, and containing, on three stories, receptacles for a preacher above, a praying minister in the middle story, and a very "pestilent fellow," called a "clerk," on the ground-floor, it is now universally the case that the preaching and praying desks, cut down from their sometime lofty estate to a moderate height, or even disappearing altogether, leave the altar not only visible, but dominating the chancel and whole church. The "clerk," with his grotesque utterance and costume, is an extinct species, and the duet between the parson and this functionary, which represented the devotions of the whole congregation, is heard no more. Then as to the administration of the supposed sacraments and sacramentals of the Establishment, a no less momentous change has taken place. Even distinctly low Church and dissenting

* Osee ii. 11.

ministers adopt a solemnity and an accuracy of gesture and rubrical observance such as Archbishop Laud prescribed for the most part in vain to his clergy, while in their dress and deportment the clergy of the Establishment exhaust every device in their unwearied efforts to reproduce the exact type of a Catholic ecclesiastic. Nor is this confined to the clergy or to the Establishment. The tone of the public mind, too, when we can trace its action in *obiter dicta*, and, as it were, off its guard on the subject of religion, is clearly different from what it was some fifty or sixty years ago. I open, for instance an old *Monthly Review* of the year 1822, and I find in an article on a town in Switzerland the following expression: speaking of Geneva, the writer says: "A free government, the *same religion*, and similar tastes, render Geneva attractive to the English." I concede that in a review or essay treating of religion such an expression might be found now either in deprecation or in applause, according to the bias of the writer; but I submit that, intention apart, it would not occur to any one nowadays to assume that Genevan Calvinism is our national religion. So, again, if you read Maitland's preface to the collected edition of his *Essays*, you will see that he elaborately addresses himself to show that it is not inexcusable for a Protestant clergyman to be fair and equitable in treating of Catholic times, and persons, and things. Nowadays the Surtees, and many other such societies, publish year by year Catholic documents which are most damaging to historic Protestantism without a word of apology. The fact is, that they themselves, and we through them, have taken most of the chief Protestant positions—for instance, and notably, the summary polemic view that the Pope is anti-Christ. None but a few old women (of both sexes) make any attempt to defend them, and the public mind tacitly consents to browse in the grass-grown embrasures and unroofed casemates of many an exploded Protestant transitional fortress. I do not forget the plea that this is in part indifferentism; but I believe the temper of mind which leads men to such inquiries and such publications is not that of indifferentism but something better and higher in the greater number.

Here also we must mention the astonishing sums of money, representing in a vast number of instances the most real and the most unobtrusive self-denial and sacrifice, lavished on the fabrics of the ancient churches throughout the land, or expended in the erection of new and magnificent imitations of them. Altars of almost unrivalled splendour, stained glass, marble and mosaic wall-surfaces, rich pavements, gorgeous metal-work, paintings of the loftiest ideal and most artistic beauty, carvings in wood and in stone, are to be found renewed or created in every church,

from the cathedral down to the village chapelry ; while instead of the paltry or misshapen monuments in wood or stone, without sign in letter or in symbol of Christianity or of any religion at all, the graves of the dead are surmounted by beautiful monuments breathing in form and inscription the faith and hope of the Christian, nay even of the Catholic, with regard to the departed.

3. But, further : to pass from these more direct evidences of an upward, or Catholic, tendency in the national religion, surely it is worth our notice how certain causes not only in their nature not conducive to such results, but positively such as would lead to adverse and contrary effects, seem to have been and are still being overruled by a force superior to the conscious intuitions of men in an opposite sense. First of these I would mention the religious movements of the last and present centuries represented by the names of Wesley, Whitfield, Law, Venn, Wilberforce, Thornton, Simeon, and the rest. Surely it is evident, on the one hand, that short of the miraculous (of which we are not now speaking), a religious movement, properly so-called, a stirring of the dry bones of the National Establishment and revival of any kind of personal religion by the *direct* operation of Catholic teaching and teachers, was never more entirely out of the question in England than when the last Stuart sovereign was reigning, and her brother and afterwards her nephew were plotting and being betrayed by worthless political gamblers ; and, on the other hand, it is more evident still that Wesley and those I have just named had nothing less at heart than the propagation of the Catholic faith : yet if the Almighty *has* decreed the recall of England to the faith, but still, in accordance with His usual moral governance of the world, does not reveal His right hand by miracle, what other way could there be for breaking up the dead and slumberous lethe of that age and country save by such agencies as those whose genesis and history is summed in those men's names ? Time would not suffice, nor is it necessary here, to point out how they broke up the long-deserted and weed-grown fields, not yet ripening to the harvest, of our fatherland, raising before the eyes of a generation sunk in so much ignorance and sloth concerning heavenly things, a vision, vivid though incomplete, of the Personal, nay, of the Incarnate, God, whose name and office were then well-nigh effaced from the national mind and conscience. They delivered a message, tintured indeed with error, and unbalanced, but earnest, and sanctioned by lives of self-denying purity, and full of the unseen and eternal things of which their times had lost at once the knowledge and the appetite—the great message of “justice and judgment to come,” the pleadings of conscience, and the presages of eternal loss or gain. More-

over, they delivered it divested of any such colour as would have deprived it at once of every chance of success ; and this not as an economy, but *bond fide* as "*the whole counsel of God,*" as they so often say.

Without this preliminary stirring of the national mind, what would have availed the scattered fragments of Catholic truth lying buried in formularies and liturgy, which the High Churchmen of a later age were to order and arrange again, and to build up amidst the scoffs of many and the mistrust of all—nay, even of themselves—into the ideal of the true and only City of God, as yet seemingly so far off, and yet so near to them? The beatitude of the Divine hunger and thirst for a justice as yet unknown, would have been prematurely bestowed on such as those who began, and of whom some still survive, the Oxford movement, unless it had been preceded by the deep sense of spiritual need, and love of a Personal Redeemer, aroused in them by these Calvinistic but earnest and pious men. Their writings and examples were the food of young souls, as yet unfitted for a stronger meat by the prejudice of birth and of education. Thus Wesley, and the rest, whose work was to become a running sore in the body-politic of Anglicanism, and the Evangelical school within it, who have long since degenerated into mere anti-Catholic fanatics, seem to me to have prepared the way for a movement which they neither contemplated nor would have approved if they could have foreseen it.

4. But now let us look for a similar paradox in a totally different direction. In the last century the whole of our literature was, as has been often said, in one conspiracy against the Catholic religion. The writings of our classical authors, from Pope—himself a Catholic, but half-drowned in the torrent of contemptuous ignorance of Catholic things around him—downwards, either entirely ignored, or grossly misrepresented and inveighed against, the truth, and a whole jargon of invective was invented and served up, in season and out of season, in large or small doses, to denounce, ridicule, and condemn the Church, and especially the Church of the middle and later ages.

The fierce persecution of the last two centuries had indeed begun to relax, and State prosecutions, the axe and the stake, had well-nigh become things of the past a hundred years ago ; but the gross violence of the mob made itself felt by the Catholics of London in 1780, in a way which showed plainly how well the people had learned to hate the faith from which their fathers had apostatized. Moreover, a new impetus and a more specious show of reason had been given to the irreligion of the educated classes by the French Freethinkers, whose efforts were soon to be crowned with portentous effects in France. Milton and Hobbes

were the philosophic parents of the French materialists and doctrinaires, who, in their turn, gave us our Bolingbrokes, Humes, and Gibbons, and Paynes, and so many more impugnors of dogmatic and historic Christianity, while in the political order our Whig statesmen and legislators were deeply tainted with the French irreligion, which suited their aims as well as it did their vices.

In the very noontide of this condition of things there appears suddenly, without assignable cause or antecedent, a group of writers who, yielding to none of their contemporaries in personal conviction of the entire error and absurdity of Catholic doctrine, nevertheless produce a new literature, destined in a short time to effect a very wide-spread and complete reaction of sentiment and feeling in the cultivated mind of the nation. Southey, learned, brilliant and absorbing; Scott, picturesque, scenic and genial; Coleridge, profound, original, seductive; Wordsworth, the pensive interpreter of Nature, her prophet and her priest—one and all true poets, rise up each in his place, and with one consent break forth with a strain of such harmony that no one that has ears to hear but must confess their song has some common origin. Whether they will it or not, they are the mouthpieces of a Spirit mightier than themselves, and instruments in a scheme beyond their ken and their intention. Thus, early in this century, as some of us can remember, the enthusiasm and ardour of our childhood or our youth were rallied, not as our fathers had been to the side of pagan virtues and formed on pagan examples, but to the great ideal of *Christendom*, its chivalry, its high enterprise, its picturesque beauty, its soul-stirring mixture of a splendid and mysterious religion, with all the shifting accidents by flood and field that form the favourite ground whereon young imaginations delight to expatiate. It was in vain that the very authors themselves strove, in foot-note or appendix, to keep up in their readers the orthodox Protestant traditions as to the folly and iniquity of mediæval belief and mediæval practice; their poetic *estro* was too strong for them, and while they tried to swell the chorus of the old malediction, lo! they “blessed us” altogether with a new estimate, at least in feeling and sentiment, of those things and persons we had been so carefully trained to hate and to mistrust. Would Maitland’s “Dark Ages,” and a host of similar books which now cover the tables and shelves of every drawing-room and book club throughout the country, ever have been written, unless they had been preceded by such poems as “Roderick the Goth,” “Marmion,” and “Cristabel,” or such novels as “The Abbot,” “The Monastery,” “Kenilworth,” “Waverley,” and so forth? I trow not. And now, if English youth, you may depend on it, have no longer the same estimate as that with which we begun

life, of such names as "priests," "monks," "nuns," "monasteries," "cloisters," and the like, why is it but because we were taught a truer one, not by the grave and authoritative teaching of Catholic educators, for we had none, but by the pens of such queer Christians as Robert Southey, LL.D., or Samuel Taylor Coleridge or Walter Scott. It matters not whether Southey's learning, or Coleridge's metaphysics, or Scott's antiquarian lore had either much or little to do with their literary success—what I dwell on is that they "made their running," as the phrase is, on ground hitherto so despised and rejected as that of the Middle Ages, by an appeal primarily directed to the most "forward and obtrusive" of all our faculties. This I esteem a stroke of Providence. If God is light and truth, heresy is both error and darkness too, and surely nowhere is it more conspicuous than in England that the strength of heresy lies in the ignorance of the people with regard to spiritual truths, in which more than in any other branch of human science contempt is the sure gauge of ignorance, as knowledge is the parent of esteem and reverence. Now, though we must admit that the mass of our people are still sunk in gross ignorance, and seem incapable of illumination in spiritual things, yet there is an advance even among them in places where High Church clergy have been at work for many years in school and church. Nor must we forget that this literary movement was manifestly the parent of similar ones in the other forms of poetry. Architecture, painting, music, have all since received a similar inspiration and impulse. It is an exception to a general rule that a Catholic bishop (Milner), and a Catholic architect (Augustus Welby Pugin), had a share, and a very large one, in the revival of a due respect and admiration for mediæval art: in both cases they were preceded by non-Catholics—viz., the Protestant Canon Nott, of Winchester, and the Quaker Rickman. But this touches on a separate topic, on which I would fain say a few words later. I will here only mention, in passing, a reflection which admits of much and interesting development—viz., the influence of the revival and spread of mediæval Christian ideas upon our language; in which you will most probably have noticed that a number of words have of late obtained a footing which were unknown, or, if known, then misapplied, a generation or two ago. Nor is it unworthy of notice that as the isolation and consequent stupid insular pride of the last age was an agent for evil in making us condemn all foreigners and foreign things, and therein of course the faith which had become strange to us, so now the contact with our neighbours and the diffusion of their tongue is productive of some good by familiarizing us with the knowledge and phraseology of their religion. I pass to another topic.

5. While our romantic poets were in their childhood or nonage

a neighbouring country was passing through the throes of a revolution which a century has scarcely sufficed to play out. An astonishing enthusiasm fell upon well-nigh the whole governing classes of the French people. A systematic attack had been planned and carried out by a band of clever specious sophists on all the existing institutions of the country; the disciples of Voltaire, of Diderot, of D'Alembert, of Volney, and J. J. Rousseau, and so many more, were to be found on the steps of the throne, in the senate, and in the magistrature—nay, in the assemblies of the clergy itself. The scheme had been contrived with a wonderful cunning; the kings of a whole continent, who were themselves a chief aim of the conspirators, were trained in the school of the new philosophy, and made use of as cat's-paws to carry out their nefarious views; infidel and philosophic ministers led them on step by step to destroy the power which had been their only possible stay and support. The Church's vanguard, that illustrious society whose privilege it is to be the first object of the hatred of the enemies of God and His Church, was disbanded and driven for shelter from the dominions of Catholic kings to those of the schismatical and heretic sovereigns of Eastern and Northern Europe. Then came the end: the Church itself in France, and wherever France had sway or influence, was clean abolished, and a vast number of her bishops and pastors were thrown on our neighbouring shores. Scarcely a family of note or position throughout the land, but received some of these sufferers into its intimacy. Either as guests and inmates, or as laborious and successful teachers, they found access to the interior of that boasted fortress—the Englishman's house and home. Eight thousand French ecclesiastics were sheltered among us; and, thanks be to God, to know them was to esteem and to love them. Besides good people had some hopes that kindness might convert them from frog-eating, popery, and wooden shoes. True they were Papists, but this vice was a vice of origin over which they had no control; idolatrous, massing priests or bishops, performers of strange rites in a "tongue not understood of the people;" but perhaps if they now came in contact with the pure Gospel, and beheld its fruits in the sanctities of English homes, who could tell whether they would not see the error and darkness of their way, and embrace the true Protestant religion as by law established? French—that is contemptible; Popish—that is abominable; eaters of vermin and worshippers of stocks and stones they were by the disadvantage of birth and prejudice of education; but then they were certainly well-bred and refined, devoted and loyal subjects of their king, and sufferers in his cause. Moreover, they played whist, and played it well; these were not small merits, and perchance were destined to develop.

Under the fostering influence of British food and port wine, their appetite for *kickshaws*, religious as well as culinary, would surely fail. His Majesty gave up his red-brick palace at Winchester to house nine hundred of these worthy ecclesiastics, and the University of Oxford set its press to work and turned out, for the use of the Gallic clergy in exile ("in usum cleri Gallicani exulantis"), a very neat edition of the New Testament—"Vulgatæ Editionis"—at once a generous evidence of good-will and a possible means of converting them to a purer faith, since, as all men knew, the main cause of the protracted existence of Popery was their ignorance and dread of reading the Scriptures. This view, by the way, must have received a check by the fact that the book bore on its title-page that it was brought out "*curâ et studio quorundam ex eodem clero Wintoniæ commorantium.*" These examples on the part of an eminently Protestant king and university were largely followed, and so it came to pass that Mr. and Mrs. Bull and their young folks throughout the land obtained an unexpected ocular proof that the cherished belief about Popish priests was, to say the least, exaggerated, if not erroneous. Neither horns nor hoofs had they: this was certain, and, language and dietary apart, they were, after all, found to be tolerable "good fellows."

Well, time went on, and the poor *émigrés* got thinner and thinner, and many that had come here till the storm should be overpast, laid their anointed bodies in the old, once Catholic, churchyards of England, to await there the resurrection of the just, and thus took possession of our land in the name of justice and of faith; but still the revolutionary tornado swept relentlessly over fair France without sign of abatement. Meanwhile, what is this stir and sound of footfalls in the little chapels served by "Mushoo," the French abbé? In back courts of great cities, or in outhouses of remote country-places, lent or let to the exiled nobility still mourning for the torrents of blue blood which flood their native land, Mr. Bull is credibly informed that "Mushoo's" flock is increased and increasing. Hundreds and thousands, nay, tens and hundreds of thousands, of emigrants are flocking into England: but now it is not the powdered and gentle noble who is to invade his drawing-room, and even place his polite legs beneath the yet more polished shadow of Mr. B.'s sacred and inviolable mahogany, but only poor frieze-clad Paddy, useful, cheap, hard-working and merry; contemptible, of course, because he is not English—and all but Englishmen are contemptible—and a degraded priest-ridden Papist. O! what would Mr. Bull have said, if he had been told that these are to become the flock who alone would render it possible that in a brief half-century, the names and functions of a Catholic hierarchy should

spread like a net over all England, the augury and presage of a "second spring"! Meanwhile, in the poorest quarters of our cities, a Catholic population grows up, and the English people have learnt to see in the dreaded Popish priest no foreign political agent, but only a quiet, hard-worked clergyman, with a definite work of mercy and love to fulfil, rewarded not by State emolument, but only by the gratitude and affection of his people. Poor they are, these Irish, and alas! too often not exemplary, nay, scandalous, if you will, in their lives; every workhouse and every gaol knows them, and the Protestant wealth and power and fanaticism of the nation buys the weak and breaks down the strong, in many and many an instance; but still, it is the great wave of Irish emigration, Irish faith, and love, and zeal, which has carried the Ark of God, His Name, His Priesthood, and His adorable Presence, to many a resting-place in town and country-side, where they had been unknown for three dreary centuries. Now, the reason why I couple these two emigrations together, is not merely because they synchronize—which is also a symptom of a Divine disposition to my mind—but because they resemble each other in the matter of causality so far as this, that neither of those causes to which they are referable—viz., the French Revolution in the one case, and Orange rule and corruption in the other—were placed by their respective authors, to say the least, with any intention or wish whatsoever to produce, however remotely, any results favourable to the propagation of the Catholic religion in England, or anywhere else.

6. And if you will allow me but one other illustration of this sort of discrepancy between man's intentions and God's results, where can I better find it than in the history of that later stage of the religious movement of our times, to which so many of us directly owe the benefit of conversion to the Faith? Who, including the Right Honourable Edward Smith Stanley, M.P., and Orange Under-Secretary for Ireland in 1833, would have supposed that by the suppression and amalgamation of certain useless Protestant Bishoprics in Ireland, he and his Tory compeers, were evoking a spirit in certain quiet college precincts in Oriel and Merton Lanes, and thereabouts, which was so soon to rend their old garments with new patches, and burst their old bottles with new wine; a spirit as subtle as it is potent, a discernor of the thoughts and intents of so many hearts, past, present, and to come?

Space warns me to say but a very few words on some remaining topics, of which the first shall be the martyrdoms and sufferings of our Catholic forefathers. If we reflect merely on the undoubted fact that, as was said of old, "the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church," it would seem that our land

which was so copiously watered with that fecundating dew, would certainly some day reap a great harvest from it; but I venture to think that a circumstance connected with the great majority of these martyrdoms gives us a special ground for hoping that this harvest of conversion would take a national or political form. I mean the circumstance that almost all the Elizabethan martyrs, and those of the succeeding reigns also, seem to have been inspired to express in their last moments ardent feelings of loyal adherence to the civil power which was so cruelly misused. No doubt this was a protest on their part against the false account which the persecutors tried to give of the cause of their sufferings. They were alleged to be traitors and to be suffering as such, and not as martyrs to the old faith, and so they loudly protested that this was a calumny, as indeed it was; but I look on it also as the registration before God and man of their willingness to suffer if their blood might by Him be accepted as crying from English ground for the conversion of the nation and polity in whose name and by whose ruler this wrong was being inflicted on them.

7. Next, as to conversions to the faith at the present time, I would remark that I am not disposed to think the number of conversions which we know are occurring at the present time, is such as to constitute a great ground of hope of the national return, merely from the point of view of number. Though absolutely considerable, relatively speaking to the whole population of the country, the number is but small; yet here again there is a circumstance not without significance. A "nation" is not constituted by a mere mob or aggregation of people without organization or ordered common life. To make the nation there must be a government, and whatever form it takes must be the result of the adhesion of the great moral corporation which embody the primary ideas and functions of civil order. Property, education, law, religion, legislation and administration, relations with other nations, and the means of repelling force by force, represent the chief characteristic interests of a civilized people, and find their expression in the great moral bodies or members of the State. If conversions not relatively numerous were confined to one or other only of these moral corporations, no doubt there would be so far no room for hopeful anticipations as to a national return to the faith; but if, on the other hand, such conversions, though few, were distributed through the whole of these interests or corporations, and form a group, as it were, of *specimens* of each and all, they put on another character and give just cause for other inferences. S. Thomas teaches that the test of a genuine national adhesion to, or rejection of, a given government, is not the test of mere numbers, but that of the mind of the great constituent moral members of the State.

Hence the existence of Catholics who are so, not by what is called the accident of birth, but by conviction and at the price of sacrifice have become Catholics, in any proportion in each of these members, is *pro tanto* an argument for the possible return of the whole. Now which of our classes in the hierarchy of civil order is quite free from the return of "Popery"? Neither the senate nor the house of knights and burgesses returned by shire or city or borough to Parliament, nor the established Church, nor the Universities, nor the bar and magistrature, nor the colleges of physicians, nor the army, nor the navy, nor the diplomatic service, nor any other branch of the public administration—all and each have paid and are paying Peter's pence in *kind*—the souls which his net is ever ready to gather out of the deep. It has been objected that, as some one put it, we have converted "Scottish duchesses but no English grocers," that is, that the middle and lower classes afford no contingent of conversions in proportion to their numbers. I grant it is so at present; but, on the other hand, I see that with a great show of independence, there are no people so accessible to aristocratic influence as the English, and no society in which a perpetual and wide process of natural selection from the lower strata goes on so constantly and rapidly. I see it in the past and I see more of it in the future. Thread your way through the carriages of the great to Mrs. Metals' afternoons in Park Lane, and you may see not one but many besides herself, whose genealogy is, if not forgotten yet forgiven, not only for their wealth's sake but for that of their real culture and refinement. They are recruits of the classes who recruit us, and their roots reach low down. Moreover, if it is true that hitherto these conversions are found only in the upper strata of our society, and as yet no signs appear of a mass movement—surely we must not forget that it was from above, from the noble and wealthy, that the ruin and decay of faith began, and unless (which is not alleged) our race and nation are completely changed in the last three centuries, it is by an analogous process that they are likely to be restored. Besides, it is not true that our converts are not only personally typical and representative, but also for the most part influential, so that scarcely one but can trace to his or her influence the further result of one or more other conversions to the faith. I say "her" because the influence of mothers is so wide and so enduring, and the proportion of female converts is said by our adversaries to be unduly large. I trust, and I thank God, that such is indeed the case.

8. Next I should mention as a ground for hopes of a national return the instincts of the faithful in all countries. It is a well known maxim of the spiritual writers that when God wills to

bestow a grace He prompts holy people to ask it of Him by ardent and persistent prayer and mortification. I am not now speaking so much of that more external leading whereby He causes His elect to repay services rendered to Him by intercession ; of this we all know many instances have been afforded by the devout cloistered and uncloistered souls in France, who repaid, and are still repaying, the hospitality of England during the Revolution by ardent prayer for her conversion—I mean rather to allude to those instances, of which the number is no doubt great though to us unknown, of holy men and women who had no personal knowledge or connection with our country, but yet were moved to pray all their life long for her return, such as were in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the holy nun, Maria Escobar, and the saintly lady Theresa de Carvajal in Spain, or in the last century Saint Paul of the Cross in Italy. Similarly I would refer to the instincts of the Holy See in such acts as the erection of the Hierarchy in 1850 ; or, again, in the nomination, unparalleled in all history, of three Englishmen to the Cardinalate at one time, and of no less than eight English-speaking Cardinals within our own memory. Whence are these promptings, and what can be the meaning of them ?

Let me advert here to the objection urged from the present aspect of a very large section of the community who form what is called the extreme High Church, or Ritualist School of Anglicans. I grant that they present an aspect of apparently increasing hostility to the Catholic Church which is at first discouraging to our hopes, raised as they were some quarter of a century ago to a high pitch by the early results of the Tractarian movement ; but, once more, the miraculous apart, how is it conceivable that the frozen soil, hardened by three centuries of neglect and error, should break forth into one vast garden of fruits and flowers in the course of less than one half-century of partial and uncertain thaw ? To expect this seems to me to mistake the whole teaching of our history, and to substitute for the warranted and sober inference from facts, a heated, fanciful theory which it is as easy to demolish as it was pleasant to build up. If there is one truth which I seem to see broadly written on the past Reformation history of our religion and country it is this—that the wisdom and goodness of God are as conspicuous in regard to us as are His justice and chastisement and judgments for our national sins ; and that in nothing are the former more evident than in the Divine attribute of *patience* as shown in the long waiting for us, both individually and collectively, to return to Him. No one alleges, either that the Almighty is bound to bring back our nation by miracle, or that He is actually doing it by that means. Now, whatever may be the destiny of individual souls

(of which we know nothing), it is certain that if a large number of the Ritualists, say some thousands, were at once to submit to the Church, the movement, whatever its final results may now be, would in that case, humanly speaking, end; for no conscientious adherent of Anglicanism would continue in a course which would thus have been demonstrated to lead directly to Rome. I believe that the hope of a national return is, on the contrary, wrapped up in a gradual, almost insensible, extension to the whole people of a knowledge of Catholic doctrine, so that when the hour of God's decree is come, and the conditions required are ready, they may yield themselves to the impulse of His illuminating and fostering grace, and that this extension can only be effected, as it is now being effected, by the instrumentality of causes operating for the most part and at present, outside the visible corporation of His Church.

9. And here let me call your attention to the fact, which I think is evident, that the *direct* influence of the Visible Church in England is remarkably absent in the various movements (especially those of a preparatory kind) on which we have touched. Even in the case of the *émigrés* it does not appear that they were what is called "proselytizers;" they contented themselves with letting the light of a fameless example shine before men, and they conquered, where they conquered at all, more by endurance of contradiction and outrage than by aggressive or demonstrative act or speech. I heard but the other day of an instance, in the person of a poor *émigré* priest who, being recognized by three fanatical youths as a foreigner and Papist, was by them actually put to death by drowning in the Thames, near Reading. As he disappeared beneath the waters, he raised his hands to Heaven and audibly prayed that God would not let his murderers die without knowing the truth. Two of them died soon after; but the third, to the amazement of his relations, insisted on seeing a priest on his death-bed, and then narrated to him these facts, and implored to be instructed in the Catholic faith, stating that the remembrance of his victim's meek end and prayer had never left him; and accordingly he was able to make his abjuration, and died a Catholic, and in the best dispositions. Other such instances may be known, but as a rule it is true to say, that all the modern conversions are owing to the *immediate* operation of the Holy Ghost on minds and souls, and that we have had but little or no direct impression made upon us by the Catholic Church in England. It would seem as if no person or persons were to be wholly credited with a work so eminently that of God's Holy Spirit. I do not overlook certain great names, chiefly of converts, who have had a direct influence on others, which must be in all our minds as exceptions to this statement:

Then they showed me "the Oak Tree (the nation) cut down to root (the Church); no man's hand aiding, no force compelling" "God alone doing it!"
 *Edmund's Vision at Edgeland falling from

I only say they *are* exceptions, and that the usual mode of God's later dealings with this nation, has been like the building of a house not made with hands: and further, that I see in this mode itself, a ground of wider hopes, and greater confidence.

But to sum up. I have mentioned, I think, nine several grounds for entertaining a reasonable, if sanguine, hope of our being as a nation restored to the faith. 1. There is the upward tendency of official Anglicanism as a system, and as a history for the first epoch of its lapse. 2. There is the present marked increase of religious observance throughout the land, as contrasted with all previous times since the so-called Reformation. 3. There are the irregular but earnest religious movements of the last century. 4. There is the literary rehabilitation of the Christian and mediæval idea by our romantic poets. 5. There is the consequence of the French and Irish migrations into England. 6. The profuse martyrdoms and other sufferings for the faith, and their special character as State prosecutions. 7. The typical and influential character of the conversions of the latter years. 8. The instincts of the Church in prayer, and of the Holy See in provision, for a national conversion. 9. The absence of *direct* Catholic influence in most of the modern conversions, on the nation. Now I am not conscious of exaggerating the importance of these topics, but, of course, they are not all of equal importance, and I can quite understand that to some minds some will seem to have little or no weight. What, however, I conceive to be of weight is their collective force. For instance, take the direction of cumulation. The first five considerations seem to have this force visibly impressed on them as a series or whole. If Anglicanism had an upward tendency, it is not possible to disconnect it from an increase of religious observance as a fruit thereof: if that fruit exists it has an antecedent history which is supplied by the religious movements of the last century and of this, and if they later took that form of a reaction favourable to Catholic ideas which they now present, that reaction was rendered possible by the revival of the mediæval ideas in literature, and by the accidents of the French and Irish immigrations at the same time. Then, again, looking to the *natural* connection of cause and effect, we are struck by seeing an absence of such a connection in most of the subjects mentioned: a bloody persecution of the Church and an infidel philosophy in one country, and a corrupt Protestant ascendancy in another, do not seem likely *à priori* to conduce to the advance of Catholicity in a third. Nor, again, would it seem probable that the first harbingers of a return on the part of many to truer and juster, and therefore kinder, thoughts of the Church, her ministers, her doctrines, and her practices, should be found in

the persons of a learned Protestant, a dreamy Germanized metaphysician, and a Scottish Presbyterian lawyer. Napoleon the First is said to have exclaimed, "Give me the making of a nation's songs and you give me the nation." Our lake poets and Scottish novelists wrote our songs, and they turned out to be Catholic psalms, though they were written by the waters of Babylon. So again the recrudescence of Calvinistic fanaticism in the last age and in this, outside and inside the Establishment, would seem not likely to pave the way for the Oxford movement, which nevertheless it did. It is this kind of overruling of things to an end which seems quite foreign to their natural result which is embodied in so many proverbs like the French "*l'homme propose, mais Dieu dispose*," and which must be in the experience of every thoughtful person's interior consciousness as regards themselves.

As to my three last topics, they touch on other and higher grounds of confidence; for every martyrdom was a special grace of God, not only in the constancy of the martyr, but in each and all of its circumstances; so is each conversion, and so are the instincts of the Holy Church of God and of His Vicar. But in all and through all that I have so feebly attempted to recall to you I think I see the evidence of a great design—a merciful resolve in the inscrutable counsels of the Most High to lead us back as a nation to Him. It would be beside the object of this Paper were I to allude to the means within our reach for the furthering of this end; and, indeed, it may be said that the tendency of my remarks would be rather to encourage us to stand aside and see the work of God accomplished by Him without our intervention. My feeling, however, is not such; for surely that which is true of the progress of the spiritual life within each soul is equally true of the aggregate souls of a race or nation—viz., that whereas we should *believe* that it is God alone who can and will convert, and sanctify, and perfect, we should *act* as if all depended on our own activity and perseverance. Nor can I admit any contradiction or opposition between the two convictions—that God, who sweetly and strongly disposes all things according to His will, designs the ultimate conversion of our nation, and that we have our share to perform in the fulfilment of the same, however subordinate and limited the sphere of our co-operation. In conclusion, I will say that I think we must all agree that we can hardly conceive it possible that we should be destined to a national return without national humiliation. May it not be that the humiliation lies in this, that every trace and vestige of our old Catholic polity is destined to destruction before the new structure is to rise again? If, as I have tried to show, the building up is eminently Divine, the

destruction is eminently human, and, whether in motive or in result, such as no Catholic can consistently admire or take part in. It was an opposite course of action—forced, we may admit, by the circumstances of the time upon Catholics, which tended as much as anything to impair their influence on the upper classes of Protestants a generation or two ago. Even forty years ago Newman could enumerate among the reasons holding back good Protestants from sympathy with Catholics “as a church, the spectacle of their intimacy with the revolutionary spirit of the day” (*“Essays,”* vol. ii. p. 71). I well remember that feeling, and I think we must deprecate giving any just cause for it now, though we may see in the acts of the destroyers just judgments of God, and the inevitable consequences of a national departure from His law.

What do we see about us at this moment? We see a Government which has subjected us as a nation to a profound humiliation, by forcing a professed and emphatic atheist and blasphemer into the national council, and, too probably, the nation accepting that humiliation. It was in that assembly that the rejection of Christ's Vicar and all his authority was made to be thenceforth the foundation of our national religion and law, three hundred years ago. We are indeed draining that cup to the dregs! In one sense it is the beginning of the end: we can go no lower. May it be so in another and happier sense! Amidst the ruin and wreck of our institutions, where the Christian character of the State, nay, even the basis of natural religion is compromised, and by a necessary consequence the national establishment of religion, the privileged classes, the landed proprietary, and hereditary rights, including the Crown and its succession, are piece-meal destroyed—all of which seems to be now visibly looming at no great distance in the future—may the right hand of God once more build up the walls of Jerusalem, and His light shine upon the island, sometime of His saints, as in the days of yore—the days of Alfred and of Edward: “*reposita est hæc spes in sinu meo!*”

✠ JAMES, BISHOP OF EMMAUS.

ART. IX.—MR. GLADSTONE'S SECOND LAND BILL.

1. *The Land Law (Ireland) Bill.* Session of 1881.
2. *Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners of Inquiry into the Working of the Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870, and the Acts Amending the same.* Together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendices.
3. *Preliminary Report from Her Majesty's Commissioners on Agriculture.* Together with Minutes of Evidence.

IT has again fallen to the lot of Mr. Gladstone to make a great effort for the pacification of Ireland by the re-adjustment of the relations of landlord and tenant in that distracted country. More than ten years have elapsed since the Land Act of 1870 came into operation, and so lately as the spring of last year its author spoke with pride and satisfaction of the effects that it had produced. "It gave a confidence," he said, "to the cultivator of the soil which he never had before;" and, after alluding to the distress in some parts of the country, he continued :

The cultivation of Ireland had been carried on for the last eight years under cover and shelter of the Land Law, with a sense of security on the part of the occupier—with a feeling that he was sheltered and protected by the law, instead of feeling that he was persecuted by the law. There was an absence of crime and outrage, with a general sense of comfort and satisfaction such as was unknown in the previous history of the country.*

It is not a little remarkable that, before a year had passed, the great leader of the Liberal party found himself constrained to reconsider the action of the law which he thus eulogizes, and to propose to Parliament a measure for the further shelter and protection of the Irish tenantry. The explanation of this change of opinion is to be found in the troubled events of the past year, and its justification in the Reports of the several Commissioners which we have placed at the head of this Article. Even the Conservative majority of the Commissioners on Agriculture, including the Dukes of Richmond and Buccleuch, bear the following testimony to the necessity of again dealing with the Land Question in Ireland :—

* Mr. Gladstone's Speech to the Edinburgh Liberal Club: *Times*, April 1, 1880.

Bearing in mind the system by which the improvements and equipments of a farm are very generally the work of the tenant, and the fact that the yearly tenant is at any time liable to have his rent raised in consequence of the increased value that has been given to his holding by the expenditure of his own capital and labour, the desire for legislative interference to protect him from an arbitrary increase of rent does not seem unnatural; and we are inclined to think that, by the majority of landowners, legislation, properly framed to accomplish this end, would not be objected to. With a view of affording such security, "fair rents," "fixity of tenure," and "free sale," popularly known as the "three F's," have been strongly advocated by many witnesses, but none have been able to support these propositions in their integrity without admitting consequences that would, in our opinion, involve an injustice to the landlord.

The minority Report of the same Commission, and the several Reports of Lord Bessborough, Baron Dowse, the O'Connor Don, Mr. Shaw, and Mr. Kavanagh, while they differ as to the form that legislation should assume, all agree in the expediency of some check being placed on the power of raising rent in an arbitrary manner. We may, therefore, summarily dismiss the objection that no Land Bill is necessary, and pass at once to the consideration of the proposed measure, and the agricultural condition of the people who hope to be benefited by it.

Mr. Gladstone, in his speech introducing the Bill, on the 7th of April, spoke of it as "the most difficult and complex question with which, in the course of his public life, he had ever had to deal;" and even his marvellous powers of exposition, and mastery over details, failed to impress the mind with the conviction that the difficulties had been overcome, or the complexities simplified. The perusal of the Bill itself corroborates this conclusion. We miss the clear enunciation of principle, the courageous recognition of right, the outspoken message of reform which are absolute essentials of a great and connected work; and which are never absent where the evil is clearly discerned, and mercilessly dealt with. Considering at present merely the *form* of the Bill, it leaves the impression of being the joint product of several minds, taking very different views of the policy to be adopted. This is probably to be explained by the necessity of conciliating opposite parties by concessions scarcely in harmony with the general plan. Not alone landlords and tenants in Ireland, but the several sections of the Liberal party, and even, to some extent, the Olympian Upper Chamber, had to be considered in the drafting of the Bill; and, in some places, it almost seems as if the impossibility of pleasing all sides compelled the draftsman to take refuge in deliberate obscurity. Ambiguity of language

and occasional inconsistencies add considerably to the intrinsic difficulty of the subject. The multitude of provisos and conditions is perfectly bewildering. It resembles more a Treaty of Peace than an Act of Parliament. Free sale is conferred, and immediately a procession of sub-clauses takes back the gift. Fair rent is defined, and the definition is forthwith qualified by repugnant and incomprehensible explanations. Fixity of tenure is flaunted before the eyes of the tenant, while ejectment for breach of statutory conditions is whispered in the ear of the landlord. In fact, it is throughout a legislative illustration of the fable in which the cow yields an ample store of milk, but invariably ends by kicking over the pail. Some defects may, of course, be supplied in Committee; but, as a general rule, the effect of the piecemeal consideration that measures receive in that stage is to increase rather than to diminish their complexity.

Before proceeding to discuss—we will not say the principles, but the contents of the Bill, it is of the first importance that we should sketch in dispassionate outline the real state of the case between landlord and tenant, so as to bring to the attention of our readers the points in which reform is required; and we shall then be in a position to appreciate what is effected by the measure, and to determine whether it ought to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the tenant.

The difficulty of forming an impartial judgment is, we must admit, greatly enhanced at the present moment by the condition of the country, and the remark obviously applies with additional force to the difficulty of legislation. No one dreams of laying down rules of diet and hygiene for a patient in the delirium of fever, or the prostration of early convalescence; yet this is practically what the legislature is called upon to do in the case of Ireland. We trust that the political excitement, the revolt against law, the social disorder, may pass away with time; but the effects of legislation must necessarily be permanent, whether for good or evil.

It cannot be repeated too often that the land question in Ireland is far more a social than a legislative problem. The relations of landlord and tenant, depending rather on *status* than on contract or tenure, are interwoven with the whole structure of society to such an extent, that an alteration of the legal conditions may produce unexpected and startling results. This must always be the case where agriculture is the only available outlet for the energies of the population, and where land acquires in consequence an artificial and factitious value. We may exemplify this by referring to what occurred on the passing of the Incumbered Estates Act in 1848. The acknow

ledged evil then was an insolvent proprietary—the desideratum, the attraction of capital. The measure produced the effects that were anticipated and desired. Capital flowed in, and land to the value of more than £50,000,000 has been sold by the Court. The insolvent owners of large estates were replaced by many small capitalists. But beyond this the legislature had not looked; if they could have foreseen the evils that resulted they would probably have paused. The purchasers, having expended their money in land speculation, naturally looked for a profitable return; they were unfettered by ties of sympathy with the occupiers, and the result was the establishment of the commercial spirit. Nothing more disastrous could have been devised by the ingenuity of demons. The influx of capital, instead of benefiting the cultivation of the soil, merely satisfied the cravings of creditors and incumbrancers, and transferred the peasantry to the serfdom of new masters. This is what the Bessborough Commission writes on the subject:—

Most of the purchasers were ignorant of the traditions of the soil—many of them were destitute of sympathy for the historic condition of things. Some purchased land merely as an investment for capital, and with the purpose—a legitimate one so far as their knowledge extended—of making all the money they could out of the tenants by treating with them on a purely commercial footing. A semi-authoritative encouragement was given to this view of their bargains by the note which it was customary to insert in advertisements of sales under the Court—“The rental is capable of considerable increase on the falling in of leases.”

The unexpected results of the Land Act of 1870 also illustrate the same position. Although it was carefully disguised, and frequently denied, the tenant acquired under that Act a *something* which he did not possess before. What was the social result? The banks and money-lenders were not slow to discover that the tenant had an available security to offer, and accordingly supplied his improvidence with loans at exorbitant interest. Three or four abundant harvests in succession deluded all parties into the belief that prosperity was permanent, and when the cycle of bad seasons returned, no corn had been gathered into the barns, no provision made for the time of scarcity, the inflated credit collapsed, the banks and money-lenders pressed for payment, and the farmers discovered too late that they had been living on their capital.

It was more especially in Ulster, where the conditions of land tenure differ from those prevailing in the rest of Ireland, that the social operation of the Land Act was unsatisfactory. What is popularly known as the Ulster Custom was legalized by that Act; but the attempt to give it the force of law destroyed in

many cases its beneficent operation. Before the Act the Custom worked well, because it rested on public opinion and mutual good-will. The landlord refrained from raising the rent so as to destroy the selling value of the tenant-right; and the tenant, on the other hand, submitted cheerfully to the "office rules," which limited the price which he should receive for his interest. But the passing of the Land Act changed all this. The landlord found that what he had permitted through indulgence, was then demanded as of right; and in return acted up to the limits of the law. He raised the rent on every transfer of the holding, so as to keep the tenant-right within reasonable bounds. The amicable relations which had previously subsisted were seriously impaired, and what seemed a boon to the tenant turned out to be a disturbance of the social equilibrium. In these instances which we have adduced the introduction of capital was neutralized by the loss of the sympathetic, but impoverished, landlord; the gift of tenant-right was prodigally lavished on the usurer, and the attempt to transform custom into law proved that the dealings of men are more likely to be harmonious when conducted on the voluntary principle than when they are restrained by legislative interference.

It must be conceded that in asserting the Irish land question to be a social rather than a legal problem, we are removing hope to an indefinite distance; for, if a law is harsh and unjust, it may be repealed; but, if society contains elements of discord, they can only be removed by the slow growth of time. How can we resist, however, the conclusion that the present laws relating to land furnish only an insignificant factor in Irish misery and discontent, when we consider that very similar laws operating in England are accompanied by peace and prosperity? Indeed the law is, in some respects, more favourable to the tenant in Ireland than in England. The Duke of Richmond's Commission reports that the Land Act "offers to tenant-farmers and cottiers in Ireland, as compared with those in England and Scotland, exceptional privileges of occupation;" and the report of the O'Connor Don contains the following recognition of the same fact:—

So far as the mere occupation of land is concerned, I do not know that the position of affairs is worse in Ireland than in other countries; on the contrary, I believe it would be found that, regarding the occupier as a mere hirer of land, his legal rights are superior, and his security greater, than in most other countries in Europe; whilst his practical rights—those recognised by the majority of landlords, and enjoyed by the majority of tenants—are in excess of the rights or the security ordinarily given elsewhere.

The paradox that the Irish tenant is thus exceptionally

favoured, and is yet represented as a martyr to the injustice of the landlord class, is only to be explained by looking beyond the statute-book into the actual conditions of Irish tenancy. The occupier of the soil has never in Ireland regarded his position as what the law defined it to be. The tenant-at-will looked on eviction as an outrage: and the leaseholder, on the expiration of his lease, was rarely called on to surrender his farm. This view received the sanction of public opinion, and was generally acquiesced in by the landlords. Custom, in fact, regulated the tenure and occupation of land—law was a superior power occasionally called in to get rid of the tenant; but the assertion of the legal right of eviction has always been condemned as an extremely harsh measure.

The Irish tenant always considers himself as the owner of his farm, speaking invariably of "*my land*," while the rent, and the rent alone, is the landlord's due. This must be carefully borne in mind in considering the question of tenants' improvements; for, by the law of Ireland as it existed until 1870, as by the law of England to the present day, if a tenant chose to build, knowing that he had but a limited interest, the landlord could resume the occupation of the farm without paying compensation for the money thus rashly expended. It is matter of every-day occurrence in England for the landlord to acquire a vastly improved property on the expiration of building leases. The almost fabulous fortunes of some English dukes have received enormous accessions from windfalls of this kind, yet the lessees of houses in Portland Place or Belgrave Square do not complain of confiscation at the inconvenient period when the ninety-nine years come to an end. But the circumstances under which the Irish tenant expends his money and labour on his holding are completely different. In the first place, he has, as a general rule, no lease for a long term, but instead, the implied right of perpetual occupancy. Secondly, the landlord acquiesces in this mode of dealing, and it would be inequitable for him to stand by until the improvements had been effected, and then to seize them under colour of law. And lastly, the nature of the tenant's improvements is very frequently such that they are absolutely indispensable for the proper cultivation and occupation of the farm. Now, is it the fact that in Ireland the greater part of the improvements have been made by the tenants? The answer is not doubtful; and we shall take it from the Reports of the Commissioners:—

As a fact, the removal of masses of rock and stone, which in some parts of Ireland incumber the soil, the drainage of the land, and the erection of buildings, including their own dwellings, have generally

been effected by tenants' labour, unassisted, or only in some instances assisted, by advances from the landlord.*

It seems to be generally admitted that the most conspicuous difference between the relations of landlord and tenant as they exist in Ireland, and in England and Scotland, is the extent to which in Ireland buildings are erected and improvements are made by the tenant and not by the landlord.†

In a country like Ireland, where the dwelling houses, farm buildings, and other elements of a farm, including often the reclamation from the waste of the cultivated land itself, have been, and must, in our opinion, continue to be for the most part the work of the tenants; this condition of things (raising rents) has created injustice in the past, and is fatal to the progress so much needed for the future.‡

Still more explicit information is furnished by a table that has been recently published by the Land Committee; and, as it is based on returns obtained from landowners, we may trust it not to understate the case in their behalf. The information is derived from 1,629 estates, comprising upwards of 6,000,000 acres, and may therefore be accepted as fairly representative of the agricultural condition of the country. On 11·01 per cent. of this large number of acres the improvements have been made entirely at the landlords' expense; on 26·62 per cent. they have been made entirely by the tenant; and on 62·37 per cent. partly by the landlord and partly by the tenant. These figures are in the nature of an admission; and they certainly place in a striking light the prevailing custom of tenants' improvements, since they can only boast of about one-tenth being the work of the landlord alone.

The Land Act of 1870 first recognized the equitable right of the outgoing tenant to compensation for the improvements and reclamations that he had made; and it seems to us, looking at the question with impartial judgment, and by the light that has been thrown upon it by full discussion, a matter at once humiliating and astounding that so just a contention was so long resisted.

The value of a tenant's improvements is only one element in the calculation of tenant-right. There is yet another, which, if not so obvious, is quite as practical. Suppose the case of a farm occupied for years by the same tenant, without any material improvements having been effected. Has he, or ought he to have, any tenant-right? By the written law the landlord has the power of turning him out, but by the prevailing custom he is entitled to remain so long as he pays his rent. This

* "Bessborough," par. 10.

† "Richmond," p. 5.

‡ Separate Report of the minority of the Commissioners on Agriculture, generally referred to as "Lord Carlingford's Report," p. 20.

practical fact of continuous occupation must be recognised. It is not the case of hiring a piece of land to make a greater or less pecuniary profit; the possession of a farm in Ireland means subsistence, if not comfort. It is as much an assured position, won in the battle of crowded life, as when a barrister or physician succeeds in establishing a practice. In a country where the only resource of the great majority is the cultivation of the soil, the actual possession of land is a valuable inheritance. Regarding the question from another point of view, it seems, at first sight, somewhat hard that a landowner cannot part with the possession of ten or twenty acres of land without creating rights that were never contemplated by the parties, and giving occasion for claims more or less destructive of his rights of property. Such cases are, however, exceptional. In the vast majority of lettings the land has never been in the occupation of the owner as a farmer on his own account; and we may therefore treat the case that has been suggested as occurring so seldom as to constitute only a theoretical grievance.

The Land Act endeavoured, by imposing a fine on the capricious eviction of a tenant, to prevent the evils that result from arbitrary disturbance. Now, the principle involved in this enactment is precisely what we have endeavoured to explain as the second element of tenant-right—the expectancy of continued occupation arising from the custom, and the circumstances of the country. Although the fine has not been heavy enough to secure, in all cases, the tenant from eviction, yet it cannot be ignored in calculating his practical interest in his farm.

It is not unusual to speak and write of Ireland as if throughout its entire area it was homogeneous in misery, and uniform in its system of land tenure. Nothing can be farther from the truth, and no mistake could be more mischievous. There is scarcely any country in which greater differences can be found than prevail in Ireland between the conditions of the tenants in different provinces, and even on different estates; and this variety adds considerably to the difficulty of legislating effectively for the more distressed classes. We may roughly divide the country into three parts with reference to the circumstances of agricultural holdings. (1) The Province of Ulster, where the custom of tenant-right has long prevailed, and is now recognized by law; (2) the larger part of Leinster, especially the counties of the Pale, where the English system is partly in vogue; and (3) the Southern Counties of Leinster and the Provinces of Connaught and Munster, which are the head-quarters of famine, discontent, improvidence, and outrage. It does not lie within the scope of this article to trace in detail the conditions of land tenure in

these three divisions ; but we may briefly indicate their principal peculiarities. The Ulster Custom of tenant-right consists in the recognized right of sale by an outgoing tenant to the new comer of his beneficial interest in the farm, subject in general to certain limitations, varying on different estates. In some cases the custom is absolutely uncontrolled, and the landlord is then but little removed from a mere rent-charger, while the tenant is the real owner of the fee. The former has no voice in the selection of his tenant, and is liable to have a worthless and improvident rogue foisted on him in that capacity. He cannot raise the rent, even if the value of land should rise, and he has to look on with the best grace he can assume, while the tenant right is sold for fabulous sums. On most estates, however, there exist Office Rules, so framed as to restrict the tenant-right within reasonable limits. Under these the landlord generally possesses a veto as to the purchaser, and some price is fixed, —three, five, or seven pounds per acre, or a certain number of years' rent—as the maximum which the incoming tenant is to be allowed to pay. It is almost unnecessary to mention that the object of thus limiting the price is to save the landlord's rent from being encroached on ; for the interest on the capital sunk as purchase money is as much rent as the half-yearly payments made to the landlord. We may observe, by the way, that this principle does not always seem to be steadily borne in mind, and many persons who are in favour of limiting the competition *rent*, do not seem to recognize the similar necessity of controlling the competition *price* of a tenancy.

So vehement is the desire to obtain land in Ulster, that it very commonly occurs that, over and above the maximum price allowed by the Office Rules, a large sum is surreptitiously paid to the outgoing tenant. One price is agreed on in the presence of the agent, while another is paid behind his back, and the new tenant enters on the cultivation of his farm with crippled resources, if not deeply in debt.

It is a curious circumstance that the origin of the Ulster Tenant-Right is involved in considerable obscurity. According to some authorities, its establishment dates from the plantation of that part of the kingdom by James I., when the grants to settlers contained a condition to give "certain estates to their tenants at certain rents ;" while others, including Judge Longfield, consider that it rapidly assumed its present form in the last decade of the last century. The advantages of the custom are that it confers practical fixity of tenure, secures to the landlord the payment of all arrears of rent on a change of tenancy, and gives the tenant such an interest in his farm as stimulates his energies by

the sense of ownership. On the other hand it is not without drawbacks. The tenant requires a double capital—the price payable for the tenant-right, and the money necessary for working the farm. His solvency is diminished, and the temptation to borrow on improvident terms is almost irresistible. If a man fails he certainly has the price of his tenant-right to fall back on; but he has to give up his farm and disappear into space. Lastly, the vagueness of the custom, which is a sort of equilibrium between the two conflicting forces—rent-raising by the landlord, and sale by the tenant—throws us back in the end on mutual understanding and harmonious relations between the parties.

We have dwelt at some length on the peculiarities of the Ulster usages, because that Province is generally pointed to as the *beau idéal* of what Ireland ought to be, and it has even been suggested that the custom should be extended by statute to the rest of Ireland. It would be of course possible to create a Parliamentary tenure resembling the Ulster Custom in its essential features; but we must remember that in Ulster itself the usages are so various in different places as to deprive the expression, "Ulster Custom," of all precise and definite meaning; and, further, it does not come within the power even of an Act of Parliament, to create, on the instant, friendly feelings between embittered foes.

The second agricultural division of Ireland—that in which, to a certain extent, the English mode of farming prevails—requires scarcely any notice; since there the practice of farmers harmonizes with the principles of law. Status does not control contract, or regulate the terms of occupancy. As a rule the tenant has taken the land with the "improvements" already made; and, if he has a lease, he is ready to surrender possession at the expiration of his term. The landlord has furnished the farm as a "going concern;" and the first principles of hiring an article for use apply in such cases, to the exclusion of artificial doctrines of partnership between landlord and tenant. It is certainly rather hard on landlords who have done everything which the majority neglect, to be subjected to a uniform system of legislation with their needy and grasping brethren. It is impossible, however, to separate one class from the other; for, although we have referred to one Province as peculiarly the land of English farming, yet even there the practice is by no means universal, and in other parts of Ireland exceptional cases exist in which everything that can be done for the benefit of their tenants, and the improvement of their farms, has been effected by the beneficent owners.

If we turn from the two Provinces whose condition we have

attempted to describe, to the remaining moiety of the island, a miserable and dispiriting spectacle presents itself. It is there, in Connaught and Munster, that the Irish Land Question starts forward in ghastly prominence. A state of things exists in some parts of those Provinces—for even there, fortunately, we find degrees of misery—that shames our boasted civilization. The dwellings of the people are often not fit for the beasts of the field, their food barely sufficient for subsistence, their clothing for decency. The land, from which in wretchedly small plots they strive to extract the means of living, is a barren and unfruitful soil, half-reclaimed bog and stony waste. Their agriculture, it is needless to say, is of the most primitive order; and their husbandry is confined to the simple operations of planting and digging their potatoes. They eke out the scanty produce of their miserable holdings by migrating to England and Scotland, where they work as harvest labourers, at wages that must seem to them splendid remuneration. These they carefully hoard, and bring back to pay their rents and supply their needs for the rest of the year.

The various Commissioners have not ignored the position of these farmers of the West, who furnish one of the most anxious and difficult problems that it is possible to imagine. The majority Report of the Duke of Richmond's Commission, refer to them in the following terms:—

With reference to the very small holders in the Western districts of Ireland, we are satisfied that with the slightest failure of their crops they would be unable to exist upon the produce of their farms, even if they paid no rent. Many of them plant their potatoes, cut their turf, go to Great Britain to earn money, return home to dig their roots and to stack their fuel, and pass the winter, often without occupation, in most miserable hovels.

And the Report of Lord Bessborough's Commission is not couched in more hopeful language:—

The condition, it says, of the poorer tenants in numerous parts of Ireland, where it is said they are not able, if they had their land gratis, to live by cultivating it, is by some thought to be an almost insoluble problem.

Professor Baldwin, in his evidence before the Richmond Commission, states that there are at least 100,000 farms too small for the support of the occupiers, and that it is absolutely necessary to "lift" 50,000 families, that is to say, to give them the alternative of migrating or emigrating. We must not dwell at too great length on the actual condition of the Irish tenantry, for our principal object in this article is to give some account of the Land Bill which has been presented to Parliament; but

it would have been impossible to deal with that subject in a satisfactory manner without having first described the status of the tenants in the several parts of the country, upon whose interests the Bill is intended chiefly to operate. This we have endeavoured to do, and have shown that there exists considerable diversity in the positions of tenant-farmers in the different Provinces—a complication which enhances tenfold the difficulty in the way of legislation.

There is one other subject to be considered, and one question to be answered, before we pass to the consideration of the Bill. We must know precisely what the evil is that is now to be redressed, and ask the tenant-farmer, "What is it that you desire?" We once more obtain our information, and receive an answer to the interrogatory from the Reports of the Commissioners. In the words of Mr. Kavanagh ("Report," p. 55) "the question of rent is at the bottom of every other, and is really, whether in the North or South, the gist of the grievances which have caused much of the present dissatisfaction." Professor Bonamy Price, who was rather roughly handled by Mr. Gladstone for his adherence to the abstract principles of Political Economy, has to admit that "great abuses have occurred in violent and unreasonable raisings of rent by some landowners." The Report of Lord Carlingford, and the minority of the Richmond Commission who sided with him, contains the following passage:—

We have had strong evidence, both from our Assistant Commissioners, Professor Baldwin and Major Robertson, and from private witnesses, that the practice of raising rents at short and uncertain intervals prevails to an extent fully sufficient to shake the confidence of the tenants, and to deter them from applying due industry and outlay to the improvement of their farms.

We might easily multiply quotations from the Reports and evidence, all tending to the same conclusion, but we will content ourselves with one more taken from the 19th paragraph of the "Bessborough" Report. After alluding to the advantages conferred on the tenants by the Land Act, it continues:—

It has, however, failed to afford them adequate security, particularly in protecting them against occasional and unreasonable increases of rent. The weight of evidence proves, indeed, that the larger estates are, in general, considerably managed; but that on some estates, and particularly on some recently acquired, rents have been raised, both before and since the Land Act, to an excessive degree, not only as compared with the value of land, but even so as to absorb the profit of the tenant's own improvements. This process has gone far to destroy the tenant's legitimate interest in his holding. In Ulster, in some cases, it

has almost "eaten up" the tenant right. Elsewhere, where there is no tenant right, the feeling of insecurity produced by the raising of rent has had a similar effect.

We are now in a position to assert that the chief, if not the only, grievance from which the Irish tenant suffers, is the liability to have his rent unfairly raised, and, in default of payment, to be ejected without compensation. His legitimate demand is, Give me security against the imposition of an unfair rent, and against capricious eviction. Considering that freedom of contract in respect of land cannot be said to exist in Ireland, this demand does not seem unreasonable, and accordingly the several Reports are unanimous in recommending the fixing of rents by some independent authority.

It might seem probable to persons reading the foregoing extracts, that the Commissioners would proceed to condemn the greed and rapacity of Irish landlords, in taking advantage of the dependent position of their tenants for the purpose of unduly raising their rents; but nothing of the kind! On the contrary, the Bessborough Commission says that "the credit is indeed due to Irish landlords, as a class, of not exacting all that they were by law entitled to exact," and Lord Carlingford bears testimony that "upon many, and especially the larger estates, the rents are moderate and seldom raised, and the improvements of the tenants are respected." The other Commissioners adopt similar opinions, and even Mr. Gladstone declared, emphatically, that the landlords of Ireland "have stood their trial, and they have been as a rule acquitted."

Now, the plain meaning of all this is that, though the landlords have, as a body, behaved well, yet there have been found some black sheep amongst them. One instance of unfair rent-raising, one harsh case of eviction, spreads like wildfire through a whole Barony, shakes public confidence, and annihilates the sense of security which it may have taken years to establish. It is unsafe, according to Mill, to ignore the influence of imagination, even in Political Economy; and if the conclusions of the Commissioners are correct, imagination is working awful havoc with the condition of Ireland. The fear of an increase of rent, and the consequential eviction, generates a sense of insecurity, which paralyzes the naturally active energies of the tenant, and produces "a general feebleness of industry and backwardness of agriculture." This dark cloud, impressing his imagination with the dread of coming misfortune, ought to be dissipated at any cost. The landlord must be prevented from indefinitely "screwing up" the rent, and the occupying tenant must be protected from his own desires.

Mr. Gladstone justifies "searching and comprehensive legislation" for Ireland by three reasons:—(1) The existence of

"land-hunger." (2) The failure of the Act of 1870, or, as he prefers to put it, the "partial success" of that measure. (3) The harshness of a limited number of landlords. These three reasons, though grouped together, and insisted on with equal force by the Premier, are not all equally extensive in their application, nor do they all unite to justify the whole of his present proposals. Thus, it is difficult to understand how "land-hunger" is to be removed by increasing the attractiveness of occupancy, and conferring, to a certain extent, the boon of fixity of tenure on the present holder. We presume, however, that this "land-hunger" is to be satisfied by the reclamation of waste lands, and by removing those whose appetite is strongest to the corn prairies of Manitoba; while the "tenure clauses" of the Bill may be assumed to be covered by the last two of his reasons. It may be considered a dangerous proceeding to legislate for a few hard cases; and, no doubt, an enlightened public opinion, and the gradual improvement of social relations, would do more to restrain the unjust exercise of arbitrary power, than the vain and futile attempt to impose countless restrictions on freedom of contract. It is a remarkable circumstance that Mr. Gladstone did not allude to the unsettled state of the country, the popular disaffection and disloyalty, the resistance to legal process, the existence of murder, outrage, and anarchy as potent reasons for reconsidering the question of land-tenure in Ireland. He did not repeat his warning, uttered in the debate on the ill-fated Compensation for Disturbance Bill, that the country was within "a measurable distance from civil war," possibly because he thought that the "measurable distance" had become infinitesimal. But enough as to the reasons for introducing fresh legislation; let us pass to the examination of the measure itself.

The Bill, which consists of fifty clauses, with numberless sub-clauses, and even in some cases a further analysis of sub-clauses into subordinate categories, is divided into seven parts. The first contains what may be called the Tenure Clauses; the second relates to the intervention of the Court; the third provides for the exclusion of the Act by the agreement of the parties; the fourth supplements in some particulars the three preceding parts; the fifth, not very logically, groups together acquisition of land by the tenants, reclamation of waste, and emigration; the sixth deals with the constitution of the Court and the Land Commission; and the seventh furnishes a glossary of terms, an enumeration of excluded tenancies, and rules for determining when a *present* is to be considered as becoming a *future* tenancy. From this bare outline it will be seen that a wide range of subjects is treated, some of which might well have been reserved for fuller development in separate measures.

That the Bill is not easy reading will be readily taken for granted, and the difficulty in understanding some of its provisions is, we must candidly confess, very considerable. We find "present" and "future tenancies," "tenancies to which this Act applies," "tenancies subject to statutory conditions," "judicial leases," and "fixed tenancies," introduced for the first time as terms of art. And, as the practical rights of the parties depend on the distinctions involved in these expressions, each clause has to be read microscopically in order to determine the future conditions of tenure. This is not the form which a great popular pronouncement should assume. Simplicity is of the first importance, but we find, instead, a cloud of technicalities, and scarcely a single clause capable of being safely interpreted without the assistance of a court of construction. To furnish occasion for perpetual litigation and acrimonious controversy is not, in our opinion, any advance towards a settlement of this vexed question; and, at all events, even if the substance of the measure be all that could be desired, this complicated form militates considerably against its chances of success. We should have preferred the enunciation of a few general principles, to the overwrought details and cumbrous scrupulosity of the present Bill. If there is really anything seriously amiss with the Land Laws of Ireland, it ought to be possible to set it right in less than twenty-seven folio pages. If the tenant has, as a matter of fact, an interest in his holding which the law does not sufficiently protect, by all means let it be recognized by legislation. If it is desirable to confer upon him something which he has not hitherto possessed, let it be granted to him, and compensation paid to those injuriously affected. But the present measure carefully avoids the responsibility of definition, and merely places landlords and tenants in a position to commence a ruinous conflict by competition sales, and litigious proceedings.

The very first clause of the Bill contains the provisions as to the sale of the tenant's interest. It is enacted that, "the tenant for the time being of every tenancy to which this Act applies may sell his tenancy for the best price that can be got for the same," subject, however, to the following restrictions:—

(1) The sale is to be made to one person only, unless the landlord consents. (2) The tenant must give notice to the landlord of his intention to sell, and thereupon, (3) the landlord may exercise his right of pre-emption at a price to be settled, if necessary, by the Court. (4) The landlord may refuse on *reasonable grounds* to accept the purchaser as tenant. And instead of leaving the reasonableness of the landlord's refusal as an open question for the Court, the clause proceeds to enumerate, in somewhat mysterious language, particular examples

of "reasonable grounds."* We have, first, "insufficiency of means, measured with respect to the liabilities of the tenancy." Insufficiency of means to pay down the purchase money of the tenancy would be comprehensible, but the tenancy being "the tenant's interest in his holding," no liabilities attach to it. Does "liabilities of the tenancy" mean the requirements of the holding, as farm stock and utensils; or merely the rent that is payable in respect thereof? We really cannot discover any meaning in this "reasonable ground," except—and this is only the result of guessing—that the purchasing tenant, after paying his purchase money, must have a clear capital sum sufficient for the working of the farm. The second ground of veto, "the bad character of the purchaser," seems likely to give rise to much ill-feeling, and to raise delicate questions for the decision of the Court. The issues to be tried by the chairman will involve him in a roving inquiry through the purchaser's entire life. His relatives, his friends and foes, the publican, the priest and the policeman, may all be called to give material evidence. And what is "bad character?" We can recognize extreme cases, but we find a difficulty in drawing a precise line. To be consistent, the Bill ought to give a right of ejectment against all "bad characters," but this it fails to do. Surely a more ludicrous provision was never inserted in an Act of Parliament. The next "reasonable ground" is "the failure of the purchaser already as a farmer," and the last, "any other reasonable and sufficient cause." We do not know whether there is any subtle intention in requiring a "cause" to be both reasonable *and* sufficient in order to furnish a "reasonable ground;" but if so, it is too refined a distinction to have much practical importance.

In a Declaration on the subject of the Land Bill, signed by all the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland—to which we shall have occasion frequently to refer—it is pointed out that "the grounds set forth in the Bill on which a landlord may refuse to admit as tenant the purchaser of a holding—as well as the right of pre-emption conferred on the landlord—interfere seriously with the tenant's right of free sale." It is, indeed, clear that the right of sale conferred by this clause falls very far short of the free sale which the tenant desires; and we think that, instead of a veto, the landlord might rest satisfied with the power of obtaining from the Court, in proper cases, an injunction to restrain the sale.

We have always considered that the importance of free sale was exaggerated; for what the Irish tenant, as a rule, wants, is

* While these sheets were passing through the press, the committee determined on striking out these limitations of the discretion of the Court; and as the Bill now stands, what is recommended in the text is practically enacted.

not to sell, but to keep his land. A small sum of money is no compensation to him for the loss of his farm, and the disruption of old associations. If the tenant possesses, or ought to possess, any property in his holding, the right of assignment—an inseparable incident of all property—should certainly be attached to it. The more straightforward policy for the legislature to adopt would be, however, to define and declare the right of property, and allow the right of sale to follow as a matter of course. But the authors of this Bill shrank from the consequences of enacting that the tenant should be a joint-owner with his landlord, and preferred to give him a right of selling—What? Presumably, what is his own to sell, the improvements that he has made, and his right of continuous occupancy, so far as it is secured by the fine on capricious eviction, and by the provisions of this Bill. The power of selling a vague and indefinable tenant-right seems calculated to introduce a practice of reckless trafficking in land which cannot but prove injurious to the interests of the agricultural community. The tenant may sell for a “fancy” price; the landlord can scarcely treat this as a reasonable ground for objecting to the purchaser, but if he accepts the newcomer as tenant, the latter, who is still a “present tenant,” may apply to the Court to fix his rent, “having regard to his interest in the holding,” that is to say, to the exorbitant price which he has recently paid for the tenant-right. This, we must say, opens up a vista of acrimonious conflict that seems perfectly endless.

We shall next consider the provisions of the Bill with reference to the question of “fair rent;” but, inasmuch as the “present” tenant occupies in this respect a somewhat favoured position compared with the tenant of a “future tenancy,” we must first examine the grounds of this distinction, and point out as accurately as we can the occasions on which a tenancy changes its tense.

The reason for placing present and future tenants on a different footing was, no doubt, that the former being in actual occupation, were not considered as free agents in contracts relating to the land which they occupied, and in which they had sunk all their capital, to which they had devoted a life-time of labour, and which possessed in their eyes a *pretium affectionis* over and above its actual value. The future tenant, in bargaining for the possession of a farm, is supposed to be influenced by none of these motives; and may, therefore, be trusted to manage his affairs in a strictly commercial spirit. But after the lapse of years, where will the difference be? The “present” and the “future” tenant will then be occupying adjacent farms under precisely similar conditions, except such as the law

imports as the privileges of the former. Both will then have, possibly, expended their capital and labour on the land; to both alike their homes will have become endeared by a thousand sweet associations, and every argument that can now be adduced for affording additional protection to the present tenant, will then apply with equal force to every occupier of the soil. The Irish Bishops place in the forefront of their Declaration, the demand that the position of the two classes of tenants shall be assimilated; and there is no recommendation contained in that important document in which we more heartily concur. It would vastly simplify the complicated scheme of the Bill, and save the agricultural community of the future from the heart-burnings attendant on unequal privileges. It must not be supposed, however, that the expression, "present tenancy" is limited to the persons now actually in occupation of land. It requires a violent break in the devolution of title to originate a future tenancy. And the circumstance, that the number of future tenants will be for some time very limited, renders the distinction even more invidious. The devisee, the purchaser, the foreclosing mortgagee, the executor, and the assignee in bankruptcy of a present tenant, will all be, to the end of time, present tenants; and it is manifest that the reason that has been given for distinguishing the two classes does not in any sense extend to the tenants of a remote future. The only ways in which future tenancies can come into existence are, first, when a sale takes place on account of a breach of contract by the tenant; and, secondly, when the landlord, having resumed possession, re-lets the land. But there is the following qualification of the latter, namely, that if the landlord exercises his right of pre-emption under the first clause of the Bill, he is for fifteen years from the passing of the Act rendered incapable of creating a "future tenancy." This must be regarded rather as a discouragement of the landlord's right of pre-emption than as a provision in favour of existing tenants. The breaches of contract which may give rise, by means of a forced sale, to future tenancies, are violations of what are called "Statutory Conditions," to which we shall presently refer. It is enough to state here that they are a somewhat stringent set of covenants that are to be implied by virtue of the Act in every case where a statutory term is conferred. If the tenant violates any of these conditions, for example, does not pay his rent, or sub-lets, he may be compelled to sell his holding, and the purchaser will then become a future tenant. This being the way in which the majority of such tenancies will arise, it is clear that their increase will be very slow, for these sales will take the place of ejectments, and will possibly be even less numerous. And at

the present rate it would take some thousands of years to exhaust the 600,000 holdings in Ireland. It is safe, however, to assert that centuries will elapse before the last "present tenant" disappears from the land.

A "fair rent" is assuredly a plausible demand, but unfortunately the word, "fair" has as many different meanings in any particular transaction as there are human beings engaged in it with conflicting interests. This is what renders the determination of a "fair rent" a problem of such exceptional difficulty; and this it is that has drawn down upon Clause 7, which attempts the determination of that unknown quantity, a perfect storm of unfavourable criticism. That it should be allowed to remain in its present form is not possible; but what Amendments the Government are prepared to adopt has not yet been declared. By this Clause every tenant of a "present tenancy"—and this is his chief privilege—may apply to the Court to fix his rent, or, in the exact words of the Bill, "to fix what is the fair rent to be paid." If it had stopped there the Clause would have been complete in itself, an absolute discretion being reposed in the Chairman. It goes on, however, to define, and perishes in the attempt. "A fair rent," it says, "means such a rent as in the opinion of the Court, after hearing the parties and considering all the circumstances of the case, holding, and district, a solvent tenant would undertake to pay one year with another." This definition is also complete in itself, but clashes with the delegation to the Judge of an unfettered discretion; for we have here, neither more nor less than the much abused "competition rent," and this certainly differs from the "fair rent," intended by the authors of the Bill. It is also to be noticed that by the very terms of the Clause, a "solvent" applicant could never succeed in getting his rent reduced, for it is the rent which he not only "would undertake," but has undertaken to pay one year with another. The most extraordinary part of the Clause is yet to come. We have had a "fair" rent and a "competition" rent introduced, and they are not only different in amount, but they are both capable of being ascertained, the one depending on the opinion of the Judge, the other being a question of fact to be ascertained by evidence. That being so, no amount of "provisoes" or qualifications can logically alter the one into the other, but that is what Clause 7 now proceeds to attempt. We shall quote this concluding proviso in full, for no description could do justice to its drafting.

Provided that the Court, in fixing *such* rent, shall have regard to the tenant's interest in the holding, and the tenant's interest shall be estimated with reference to the following considerations, that is to say —

(a.) In the case of any holding subject to the Ulster Tenant Right Custom or to any usage corresponding therewith—with reference to the said custom or usage;

(b.) In cases where there is no evidence of any such custom or usage—with reference to the scale of compensation for *disturbance* by this Act provided (except so far as any circumstances of the case shown in evidence may justify a variation therefrom), and to the right (if any) to compensation for improvements effected by the tenant or his predecessors in title.

A practical man might have little difficulty in determining what would be a fair rent to pay, or what a solvent tenant as a fact would undertake to pay; but, when such a proviso as this has to be construed, we can anticipate nothing but confusion and uncertainty. We can scarcely conceive so much obscurity of language arising, except as the fitting medium for obscurity of thought. If there had been a policy, or a principle, it would surely have come forth with perfect clearness. We cannot undertake to solve this legislative conundrum, but we may indicate a few of the difficulties in the way of solution; and, taking principle as our guide, we may venture to suggest what the definition of "fair rent" should have been. One of the most obvious and striking difficulties in the interpretation of the clause is this: something is manifestly to be deducted from the full competition rent, because the tenant possesses an interest in the holding, and it would be unjust that he should pay rent for what was his own property. The rent, however, is a periodical payment, the tenant's property a capitalized sum. Until the rate of interest is fixed, the problem remains indeterminate. What annual deduction is to be made in respect of an ascertained capital sum? If we suppose the case of a tenant who has purchased the tenancy applying under this Clause to have his rent fixed, we must assume that in general his "interest in the holding" would be assessed at the purchase money which he had paid. The deduction from his rent, however, cannot be made to depend on whether he has borrowed the money at four, five, or ten per cent.; and if not at the rate of interest he pays, or if he has provided the purchase money out of his own resources, how is the rate to be fixed? This may appear a trivial point, but it illustrates the vagueness that pervades the necessary process of calculation. Again, the tenant's interest is to be estimated with reference "to the scale of compensation for disturbance." That scale, however, is fixed on the hypothesis that the tenant is dispossessed; under this Clause he is to continue in occupation; moreover, that scale only prescribes certain maximum payments beyond which the Court cannot go, and the circumstances of the eviction have to

be taken into account in determining the compensation to be paid ; but if there is no eviction there are no circumstances which the Court can regard, and, therefore, no means of estimating, for a totally different purpose, the amount which the Court would have awarded if there had been a "disturbance." Lastly, and this objection strikes at the root of the principle of "compensation for disturbance;" the higher the rent the greater is the compensation which the landlord has to pay. But it is manifest that the higher the rent, the less is the balance of profitable interest belonging to the tenant, and the less the deduction that should be made from a competition rent in respect of such interest. A rack-rented tenant who has made no improvements possesses no real interest in his holding, which would, or ought to fetch any price under Clause 1 ; yet, if he is evicted, the compensation which he may receive is larger than what might be awarded to a man who had a large margin of profit in the cultivation of his farm. This is comprehensible as a penal clause against rack-renting landlords, but when it is adopted as a standard for the adjustment of continuing contracts we must admit that we fail altogether to see the force of its application.

The question of fair rent, we believe, might be confidently left to the determination of any competent tribunal, and the attempt to assist the discretion of the Court by a legislative declaration of principle is only calculated to impede justice and foster litigation. There is no tenant in Ireland, it must be remembered, who does not himself know whether his rent is fair or not, and a complicated Clause, with endless provisos and mystifications, is just the thing to tempt the speculative tenant to try his chance with the Court. Universal litigation is an evil to be avoided if possible. The appeal to the Court ought to be discouraged except in hard cases. It should not be made an ordinary incident in the tenure of land, for we are fully convinced that the prosperity and progress of the country depends more upon the introduction of happier relations between landlords and tenants, forbearance on the one side, industry and good-will on the other, than on any paltry reductions, or it may be increases, in the amount of rent. But if the legislature is not satisfied to leave to the Court a full and uncontrolled discretion as to the fixing of a fair rent, and insists on laying down some guiding principle to regulate its decisions, we think that sub-clause 9, of this Clause indicates the direction which such interference should take. That sub-clause gives power to the Court to fix "a specified value for the holding." It means, we presume, the "tenancy," or tenant's interest in the holding, for it goes on to declare that, in case the tenant is desirous of

selling during the statutory term, the landlord may resume possession on payment to the tenant of the amount so fixed. Now this sum is clearly the ascertained value of the tenant's property. Why should not the Court be empowered in all cases to ascertain this value, and deduct, from the full or competition rent, interest at four or five per cent. on this capital sum? This, it seems to us, would meet all objections. The tenant would no longer be required to pay rent for what was in reality, if not in law, his own property; and the duties of the Court would be reduced to the ascertainment of facts, and a simple arithmetical calculation.

Let us now turn to the subject of Fixity of Tenure, and seek to extract from the tangled network of this Bill an answer to the question, How far is the tenant secured in his holding? Security we have seen is his chief desideratum, security not only against eviction, but also against arbitrary raising of rent. The latter is provided against, after a fashion, by the Clause which we have just been engaged in discussing; but it is obviously of no use to fix the rent unless you also secure the continued enjoyment of the farm. The fine on capricious eviction imposed by the Land Act of 1870 was intended to operate in this direction. That it did, to a great extent, carry out the intentions of the legislature in that behalf we have little doubt; yet, in particular instances, as appears from the evidence before the Commissioners, the greedy incoming tenant not only paid the fine for getting rid of his predecessor, but also offered an increased rent to the landlord. Accordingly, the scale has been raised by this Bill to a prohibitory standard. Thus, for example, whenever the rent is under £30 the compensation may amount to seven years' rent, an allowance which has been hitherto limited to a £10 valuation; and at the other end of the scale the change is still more marked. No matter how large a tract of land may be included in the tenancy, a fine of three years' rent may be awarded against a landlord. Under the Land Act, on the contrary, only one year's rent was payable when the holding was valued above £100, and in no case could the compensation exceed £250. It is clear that the stringency of these provisions ought to secure their object; for, certainly, the landlords as a class could not afford to pay such heavy sums for the gratification of a whim. There is one serious blot in the proposed scale of compensation for disturbance to which we desire to call attention. It proceeds *per saltum*, and at the limiting figures of each class the amount payable to a tenant is suddenly diminished. An alteration of a shilling in his rent may reduce his compensation from seven to five years' rent. This was avoided in the Act of 1870 by a somewhat crabbed

clause enabling him to claim under any lower class, his rent being reduced in proportion for the purposes of calculation. Let us illustrate this point by an example. Suppose that there are two tenants, the one paying £29, the other £30 a year as the rents of their respective farms. Now, under the proposed scale, the former could claim seven years' rent, or a sum of £203, while the latter, who pays a higher rent, could under no circumstances obtain more than five years' rent, or £150. The same sudden inequality prevails in the transition from every class into the next. There is, in fact, a want of continuity in the assessment of compensation which in particular cases works injustice. This, we think, ought to be amended by enabling a tenant to claim under any lower class, his rent being reduced by a proportion to the maximum limit of the class under which he claims. This mode of securing the tenant's position, is however, only an indirect provision; the more important scheme of the Bill in relation to fixity of tenure remains to be considered.

The "statutory term" is fixed at fifteen years; and for those fifteen years the conditions of tenure are to be unalterable. The rent cannot be raised, and the tenant cannot be evicted, except for breach of the "statutory conditions." Now this statutory term may arise in two ways; either when the landlord attempts to raise the rent if the tenant agrees to the increase, or when the "fair rent" is fixed by the Court. In both cases there is absolute fixity for fifteen years. But what happens on the expiration of that term? Mr. Gladstone is reported to have stated that "at the end of that period the tenant will of course give up his holding."* We are unable to discover in the Bill any such provision; and, indeed, it would be out of harmony with the entire scheme of the measure. It is expressly provided by Clause 7, sub-clause 11, that "during the currency of a statutory term an application to the Court to determine a judicial rent" shall only be made during the last twelve months of the statutory term. It leaves undefined the position of the tenant who permits the statutory term to expire without making any application; but we cannot doubt that such a tenant will be still a "present tenant," and, as such, entitled to have his rent revised by the Court. This view is confirmed by the preceding sub-section, which provides that "a further statutory term shall not commence until the expiration of a preceding statutory term, and an alteration of judicial rent shall not take place at less intervals than fifteen years." We believe the intention is to confer upon the tenants holding statutory terms

* *Times*, April 8, 1881.

indefinite "fixity of tenure," subject to the statutory conditions, and also subject to periodical revision of rent; but it is curious that so vital a point as this should be left to be discovered by inference, instead of being expressly stated. Still more extraordinary is it that the position of lessees should not be accurately defined. The forty-seventh Clause exempts existing leases from the operation of the Act, the express terms of those written contracts being allowed to regulate the conditions of the tenancy. But at the expiration of the term, is the lessee to give up his farm without compensation, or is he a tenant of a "present" or a "future tenancy?" If he is to give up possession in accordance with the usual covenant in that behalf, a large number of occupiers will be excluded from the benefit of Bill; a class, too, quite as necessitous, and as much in need of protection, as the tenants from year to year. If, on the other hand, he is to become an ordinary tenant, whether present or future, considerable difficulty arises as to the terms on which he is to hold his farm. The rent may have been fixed on the granting of the lease many years ago at a figure by no means representing the present letting value of land, and, moreover, it may have been reduced in consideration of covenants in the lease, or by reason of the payment of a fine. It would, therefore, be inequitable to treat the tenancy as continuing upon the sole condition of paying a rent which had been determined with reference to totally different circumstances. The difficulty might be met by allowing either party in case of disagreement to apply to the Court to fix a fair rent under Clause 7, as if the lessee were an ordinary tenant of a "present tenancy." This is substantially the recommendation made by the Bishops in their Declaration. They also advance the opinion that "tenants holding under leases made since the passing of the Land Act, 1870, should have the right to submit them for revision to the Court, both as to amount of rent and other conditions." This, we regret to say that we cannot support in its entirety, since it seems an unwarrantable interference with existing contracts; but, possibly, some provision might be inserted giving the tenant the option of surrendering his lease, assuming the position of a "present tenant," and applying to have his rent fixed for the statutory term.

The provisions of the Bill on the subject of fixity of tenure are ingenious and satisfactory, at all events as applied to the ordinary yearly tenancies, which constitute the great majority of Irish lettings. We must now briefly refer to the "statutory conditions," or implied covenants of the new tenure. The first is that the "tenant shall pay his rent at the appointed time." This, at first sight, appears to require the strictest

punctuality on the part of the tenant if he is to avoid committing a breach of the statutory conditions, and thereby rendering himself liable to the penal consequences; but when we remember that in ejectment for non-payment of rent the tenant has six months in which to redeem, we anticipate little difficulty in the practical working of this hard and fast rule. The next is that the tenant shall not commit "persistent waste," by dilapidation of buildings, or deterioration of the soil, after notice has been given to him to desist. Then follow provisions for securing the landlord's right of mining, quarrying, cutting timber, making roads, and sporting. Little exception has been taken to the justice of the foregoing conditions; not so as to the last two in the series, which are that the tenant shall not, without the consent of the landlord, sub-divide, or sub-let; and that he shall not do any act whereby his holding becomes vested in a judgment creditor or assignee in bankruptcy. As to the former, it is thought desirable by many persons that in the case of large holdings, the occupier should be at liberty to assign a part, not less, say, than thirty acres, provided he also retains in his own hands a farm of a similar extent. It is argued that, in a country like Ireland, where "land hunger" prevails to such an extraordinary degree, every facility should be given for the accommodation of as many persons as the land will hold. From this view we respectfully dissent. The acknowledged evil of Irish tenure is the wretchedly insufficient farms on which multitudes of the inhabitants strive to exist. That lies at the root of all Ireland's miseries; and the natural causes tending in the direction of continuous sub-division are so powerful, that they do not require to be assisted by legislation. There are nearly a quarter of a million holdings in Ireland under fifteen acres, and most of these are cultivated in so slovenly a manner that, by moderately good farming, the occupier might actually double his income.* We are as bitter enemies to "clearances" and "consolidations" as any tenant in Ireland, but we are averse, on the other hand, to deliberately sowing the seeds of destitution and famine. The condition which forbids the tenant from doing any act whereby his holding becomes vested in a judgment creditor or assignee in bankruptcy, seems calculated to give rise to curious "triangular duels." The tenancy, like all the other property of a bankrupt, confining our attention to that case, passes to the assignee; but not being in possession he is not a tenant. He has to take steps to compel a sale or surrender. In the meantime the landlord is entitled to treat the tenancy as determined by the breach of

* See Professor Baldwin's Evidence before the Richmond Commission, 2,867 *et seq.*

the statutory condition, but if he brings ejectment the tenant is expressly authorized to sell, and being a bankrupt it is not easy to see how he can confer a title on a purchaser. Similar interesting questions will probably arise when a judgment creditor or mortgagee attempts to enforce his security; but we have dwelt sufficiently long on the proposed fixity of tenure and its conditions, and must now pass to the other scarcely less important provisions of the Bill.

One striking result of the changes introduced by the tenure clauses is, that in future ordinary leases will be so much waste paper, unless indeed the farm is valued at £150 or upwards, and the parties expressly exclude the operation of the Act. The third part of the Bill, however, introduces what is called a "judicial lease." It must be for a term of at least thirty-one years, and be approved by the Court on behalf of the tenant. This is practically the only way in which leases can henceforward be granted by the landlord, or accepted by the tenant; and amounts to an admission that freedom of contract no longer exists in Ireland.

The "fixed tenancy" is one more form which the relations of landlord and tenant are permitted to assume. It seems to amount to a perpetuity, the landlord's reversion being converted into a rent-charge, which "may or may not be subject to re-valuation by the Court." It is somewhat inconsistently declared that it shall not be deemed "a tenancy to which this Act applies," and yet the "Statutory Conditions" are imported as defining the terms of the tenancy. If any of these are violated, the landlord may recover the premises in ejectment; but, surely, it cannot be intended that the evicted tenant should have none of the privileges of an ordinary tenant as to the sale of his tenancy. It is also noticeable that complete silence prevails as to the "quality" of the fixed tenancy. Is it a freehold or a chattel? The answer is of course important, not only as affecting the rights of a deceased tenant's representatives, but also in respect of electoral qualifications, and fiscal liabilities.

It is with pleasure that we turn from the tenure clauses of this complicated measure, to its other provisions, which, at all events, can be understood without difficulty. Part five includes the subjects, "Acquisition of Land by Tenants," "Reclamation of Land," and "Emigration;" whose only logical connection is that they all involve an application of public money. We can only afford a brief notice of these important contributions to the settlement of the Land Question, but a few words will suffice to place before our readers the main outlines of their provisions. The land Commission is authorized to advance to purchasing tenants three-fourths of the purchase-money of their holdings; and, what is perhaps still more important, it can buy an estate

in globo, and re-sell in suitable parcels. These powers are, of course, hedged round with provisions to secure the State from eventual loss, and the experience of the sales under the Church Act points to the conclusion that serious defalcations are not to be anticipated. We rejoice to see that the Commission is to have power to indemnify the tenant against incumbrances, or doubtful titles; and that the sales may be negotiated at a fixed percentage, according to a scale to be settled from time to time. These provisions will do much to facilitate the practical working of the scheme, and to avoid the rocks on which the "Bright Clauses" of the Land Act suffered shipwreck. The advances to the tenants are to be paid back by an annuity of five per cent. on the sum advanced, payable for thirty-five years. The conditions annexed to holdings while subject to the payment of this annuity, are not so onerous as those contained in the Land Act; for the tenant can sell at any time, with the consent of the Commission, and without such consent when half the burthen has been discharged; and the absolute forfeiture incurred by a tenant under the former Act, on alienation, or sub-division, is replaced by a sale of the interest thus attempted to be dealt with.

The reclamation of waste lands is a subject of such interest and importance that it might well furnish the occasion for separate consideration. The provisions of the Bill seem to us meagre in the extreme. One clause attempts to deal with this complicated problem, and the method adopted is to authorize the Board of Works, with the consent of the Treasury, to make advances to companies formed for the purpose of reclaiming waste, drainage, or other works of agricultural improvement. As the Government advance is not to exceed the amount actually expended out of its own moneys by the company, it is clear that the success of the scheme will depend on private enterprise, and on the somewhat remote prospects of remunerative return. Under these circumstances we anticipate that it will prove almost wholly inoperative.

The subject of emigration is still more crudely treated. The Bishops of Ireland condemn, in no measured language, all attempts to foster the already strong incentives impelling the Irish peasantry to leave their native shores. They say, in the Declaration, to which we have previously referred:—

We cannot but regard emigration, and every Government scheme, however well intended, that would encourage it, as highly detrimental to Irish interests.

In the face of this authoritative denunciation, we think the Government would act a prudent part in suffering Clause 26, the only one relating to this subject, to drop quietly out of the Bill. Emigration, no doubt, now exists as a fact that cannot be ignored, and the circumstances under which the emigrants

land in a foreign country are highly detrimental to their moral and material welfare. Much of the evil that falls on the individuals might, we believe, be averted by the voluntary exodus of entire communities; but no measure of success could be commanded against the express disapproval of the Clergy, by whom alone the scheme could be worked to a prosperous issue. It is tantalizing to read of tracts of vacant land needing only the rudest plough, the very simplest husbandry, to suffer transformation from a desert into a cornfield, and then turn our eyes on the barren wastes of Connaught, overcrowded with a starving population; but we repeat that without the hearty co-operation of the Priests it is worse than useless to attempt the exportation of the peasantry.

There is another subject which, although not included in the Bill, is of pressing importance. We allude to the existing arrears of rent. There are great difficulties in the way of dealing with this question in such a manner as to afford practical relief where it is absolutely necessary, and at the same time to avoid violating the principles of natural justice. We are confronted by a state of circumstances in which some men cannot, and others will not, pay the rents which they have contracted to pay. Any measure devised for the purpose of dealing with this subject should be so framed as to permit of a sound discretion being exercised in the discrimination of these two classes. We have no sympathy with the well-to-do farmer who merely avails himself of the existing agitation to avoid payment of his just liabilities; and who, after compelling his landlord to incur the odium of extreme measures, at the last moment draws from his pocket the bundle of notes which he should have paid over some months before. But there is also, undoubtedly, a large class of tenants who have suffered by the agricultural distress to such an extent that they are not able to pay at once the arrears of rent due to their landlords, and for these some provision ought to be made. We do not see our way to recommending a total extinguishment of all arrears, for that would be to confound the prosperous and the necessitous tenants in one enactment; and, moreover, would be open to the charge of bare-faced confiscation of the landlords' rights. But the subject may be treated in one of two ways. Either the Court may be authorized to capitalize arrears where it sees that the tenant is unable to pay; or the Treasury might advance the necessary sums to liquidate existing claims. In both cases the capital sums might be paid off by an annuity extending over a certain number of years. Without some such provision, we feel assured that the Land Bill of this Session will fail, in its immediate effects, as a message of peace to Ireland.

We have not alluded to the machinery by which this important

measure is to be worked ; yet, as a practical question, very much of its success must depend on the spirit in which it is administered. It is to be feared that the part of the Bill dealing with the constitution of the Court and of the Land Commission will not prove by any means satisfactory. The Court that is to take cognizance of the numerous and important questions that may arise between landlord and tenant is the Civil Bill Court of the county where the holding is situated. The Judges of these Courts—the County Court Judges—have been recently reduced in number from thirty-three to twenty-one, and their time is already fully occupied by the discharge of their existing duties. Moreover, in the exercise of their jurisdiction under the Land Act, they have failed to impress the tenant farmers of Ireland with that confidence in their impartiality, which is above all things necessary as a condition of success in a Court of Arbitration. We would not, for a moment, be understood as impugning the perfect fairness and uprightness of those functionaries, but it so happens that their decisions have tended to impress the tenants with the belief that the law was framed in the interests of the landlords. Again, the Land Commission, which is constituted a Court of Final Appeal from the decisions of the Chairman, is composed of three persons, described in the Bill as A.B., C.D., and E.F., one of whom is to be a Judge of the Supreme Court. But as the salary attached to the office is only two thousand pounds, it is manifestly the intention of the Government that the judicial member of the Commission shall continue to hold office in his former capacity. If the Land Commission is to be anything more than a dignified nonentity we do not see how any of its members can discharge other functions. Considering the vast and unrestrained powers that are vested in this body, powers involving an adjudication on the rights of all the landowners and tenants in Ireland, it is of the highest importance that their character and position should be such as to furnish a guarantee, not only for impartiality, but also for the highest administrative and judicial capacity. These Commissioners hold their appointments at the pleasure of the Crown, and are removable without compensation or retiring allowance. A considerable part of the actual work of the Commission, will, no doubt, be performed by the Assistant Commissioners, whose appointment by the Lord Lieutenant the Bill contemplates ; and as all the powers of the Commissioners, without limit or qualification, may be delegated to a single Assistant Commissioner, it is too apparent that the Bill is open here to the grave charge of entrusting the most delicate and difficult functions to a tribe of underpaid, and consequently inefficient, functionaries.

We must now conclude our criticisms on this important

measure. Our readers will understand that, while we deplore the unnecessarily cumbrous form in which it has been cast, we find in its substantive proposals much that is calculated to improve the relations of landlords and tenants in Ireland. Its central position, that an independent tribunal should be charged with the revision of rent is of cardinal importance, and recognizes one of the unhappy necessities of Irish land tenure. Its treatment of the other F's is not so satisfactory. The attempts to create, in various ways, fixity of tenure, are complicated and highly artificial; while the clause dealing with free sale is so mutilated by conditions and provisos that it can be expected to do little more inaugurate a new era of struggle and strife.

The prospects of the measure becoming law are, as we write, still somewhat remote. More than two months have elapsed since it was introduced, and almost every Government night has been occupied with its discussion. In spite, however, of the energy with which it has been pushed forward, the Committee is still engaged on the first Clause of the Bill; and when the House adjourned for Whitsuntide, after thirteen sittings devoted to the Bill, only six lines had been considered in Committee. Upwards of fifteen hundred Amendments, were, shortly after the second reading of the Bill, placed on the paper, of which only an inconsiderable number have as yet been disposed of; and unless some practical mode of sifting the chaff from the grain is discovered, the time that will be consumed in their discussion will be almost interminable. Mr. Gladstone has already thrown out a significant hint that under certain circumstances it may be necessary to propose "urgency"; but it is difficult to see how this dictatorial policy could be adopted in the case of a complicated measure like this, every line of which requires the most careful consideration, without infringing the rights of Parliamentary discussion. The hint, however, has not been thrown away, and already the Liberal members have met and filtered down their amendments, with the result of relieving the paper of at least one hundred; and there can be little doubt that it will also have a salutary tendency towards checking loquacity and incipient obstruction.

There is only one thing certain, that the Government are pledged to their Bill, and will adopt any legitimate means to force it through all its stages. We trust, in the interests of all parties, that no factious opposition may arise in the course of the discussion to impede its progress; for it is now clear to all impartial minds, that the sooner a fair and equitable adjustment of the Land Question is arrived at, the better chance there will be of a restoration of peace and goodwill among all classes in Ireland.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Dr. BELLESHEIM, of Cologne.

1. *The Katholik*.

THE March issue of the *Katholik* contains a very able exposition, contributed by Professor Bautz, of Münster University, on Luke xxii. 43, "apparuit angelus confortans eum." In the same issue I commented on the pamphlet published in January, 1881, at Rome, by Cardinal Zigliara, "*Il Dimittatur e la spiegazione datane dalla Congregazione dell' Indice pel Cardinale Tommaso Maria Zigliara, dell' Ordine dei Predicatori.*" It is generally known that the Congregation of the Index, when some works of the learned Abbate Rosmini were submitted to its examination, gave the decision "dimittantur." Rosmini is an eminent writer, whose philosophical system is still largely supported in Italy. The decision of the Congregation originated a bitter strife amongst Catholic philosophers in Italy. The meaning of the word, "dimittantur," some contended, was as much as a testimony or a "passport" of orthodoxy; whilst others interpreted it as only a permission given for a certain time, but which, in other circumstances, might be withdrawn. A year ago, June 21, 1881, the Congregation solemnly declared the sense of the word "dimittatur" to be, "*opus quod dimittitur, non prohiberi.*" Cardinal Zigliara, who is a learned theologian and acute philosopher, displays much knowledge of theology, history, and canon law in establishing this explanation of the holy Congregation. He begins by explaining the various form of approbation given by the Church to Catholic books; such approbation is either definitive, or elective, or permissive. A "definitive" approbation is stamped with a dogmatical character; once bestowed on a book, it cannot be withdrawn. The "elective" approbation means that the Church chooses a book, or a sentence, in preference to another one. It does not give dogmatical authority to a theological work; it is based on the knowledge which the authorities in the Church possess, "*hic et nunc.*" This approbation is far more than a simple permission. Nevertheless, as our author appropriately points out, it does not exceed the limits of what is more or less likely. Hence, it might happen that a sentence held to be only probable, might, by a process of development, come to be held as certain, and obtain from the Church a definitive approbation; whilst, on the other hand, opinions less probable might eventually turn out to be erroneous, and then, although formerly permitted, would no longer be permitted by the authorities. Lastly, comes what

is styled the "permissive" approbation. It is no real approbation, as in the two former cases, since it does not contain any judgment as to whether or not errors exist in a book; it claims only a mere negative importance; the work which is permitted or dismissed is not prohibited. Cardinal Zigliara clearly shows that the "dimittatur" does not in the least imply a definitive, nor any elective approbation. The Cardinal also establishes the truth of his thesis from ecclesiastical history. As early as the fifth century, Pope Gelasius pointed out the aforesaid approbations by distinguishing three sorts of books. Firstly, the books of the Bible inspired by the Holy Ghost, together with dogmatical decrees of the Popes and œcumenical councils; secondly, the works of the holy fathers; and thirdly, a class of books which he permits the faithful to read, whilst reminding them of St. Paul's words, "Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete." A sample of the third class of books was shown in the works of Eusebius of Cesarea. The same distinction is established by Cardinal Turrecremata in his explanation of cap. "Sancta Romana ecclesia," dist. 75. In the last part of his pamphlet our author answers two important questions, largely discussed in Italy by Rosmini's supporters and adversaries. 1. May books that have been only permitted, be re-examined and impugned by Catholic authors who are unable to agree with them? 2. May the Church withdraw the permission given in favour of a Catholic book as soon as certain weighty reasons call on her to do so? Both questions are answered in the affirmative by the Cardinal. I may also call the reader's attention to the learned work in which all questions bearing on the "Dimittatur" are exhaustively treated. Its title is "Seraphini Piccinardi, De approbatione S. Thomæ," Patavii: 1683.

2. *Historisch-politische Blätter*.—The March number contains a critique of the recent edition of Cardinal Contarini's correspondence from the celebrated diet of Ratisbone, 1541, published by Dr. Pastor, of Innsbruck University. We are indebted for it to the kindness of Cardinal Hergenröther, who, on being appointed keeper of the secret archives of the Holy See, admitted Dr. Pastor to the immense treasures heaped up there from all parts of the Catholic world. Contarini's correspondence, long searched for in vain, was finally found in Vol. 129 of that part of the Vatican Archives which bears the name, "Bibliotheca Pia." Of its importance no words need be said. German Protestant historians for centuries have been accustomed to claim the papal nuncio Contarini for the Protestant Reformation. It cannot be denied that Contarini, owing to his indulgent and meek character, did his utmost to bring over to the Catholic Church the champions of Protestantism sent to Ratisbone—Melancthon, Bucer, and Sturm—but it would be totally inconsistent with all historical truth to claim him for the Reformation. His orthodoxy, his zeal for the Apostolic See, as well as his kindness and forbearance towards the Church's disobedient sons, are clearly testified by the recently discovered letters dragged out from the dust of three

centuries. Contarini strongly opposed the opinions of the Protestant theologians about the real presence, and constantly blamed them for their ambiguous terms. Those unhappy men were most anxious not to offend their secular princes, and for fear of disagreeing with them, dared not bring forward their real opinions. The one who was sunk in the deepest slavery was Melancthon. Contarini's letters leave no doubt about it; the Reformer sighed under the cruelty of the Duke of Saxony, and was afraid of losing his life.

The March and April numbers contain the concluding articles on the "Wanderings of *Jansenism* through Europe." Next to France and Germany, we meet with the pestiferous influence of the sect in Italy and Portugal. A very stronghold of Jansenism in Northern Italy was the University of Pavia. To prove to Italian Catholics at Milan the orthodoxy of the new creed, a work was published in 1786—"Del Cattolicismo della chiesa d'Utrecht." It was triumphantly replied to by Canon Mozzi, in his "*Storia delle Rivoluzioni della chiesa d'Utrecht*," a work of great learning, and still well worth reading. The last article examines the influence of Jansenism in Portugal. The Nuncio Pacca—afterwards Cardinal—who represented the Holy See in Portugal from 1795 till 1802, soon learned how detrimental an influence had been brought to bear on Portuguese Catholics by Jansenism. It there enjoyed the protection, not only of the Government, but also of certain members of the higher clergy, amongst whom we cite the Bishop of Viseu, Don Francesco Mendo Trigozo, who ascribed the translation of the Jansenistic Catechism of Montpellier to a "special act of God's Providence," declaring that he would be guilty of sin if he did not introduce it into his diocese. The sect, the Cardinal says, by its hypocritical behaviour, has succeeded in persuading the governments to believe that its adherents are the most faithful subjects of the Church, and the most sincere defenders of the rights of the governments against the so-called encroachments of the Roman Court. The Government most unfortunately trusted such assertions; hence there was sown that seed from which sprang so many disasters in those countries.

The second May issue criticizes a very important book, which may fitly be styled a definitive sentence on a question eagerly discussed for some years amongst Catholics, viz., "Who is the author of the '*Imitation of Christ*?' " The book bears the title, "*Thomas à Kempis, als Schryver der Navolging van Christus gehandhaafd door P. A. Spitzen, oud-hoogleraar te Woormond, pastor te Zwolle. Utrecht: 1881.*" It is indeed curious, that in the recent dispute about Thomas à Kempis and Abbot Gersen no voice has been heard from the very country which for centuries was commonly held to have given birth to the author of the "*Imitation*." Spitzen, the parish priest of Zwolle, has broken the silence, and has succeeded in establishing two important facts: A person called Giovanni Gersen never existed; Thomas à Kempis is the author of the "*Imitation*." Spitzen brings forward six facsimiles of the most important manuscripts of the "*Imitation*," and by palaeographical reasons utterly destroys the opinion

about manuscripts of it dating from the beginning of the fourteenth century. There are, on the contrary, evident proofs that the oldest manuscript codex of the "Imitation" is not older than the middle of the fifteenth century. But far more weighty are the historical witnesses bearing testimony for Thomas à Kempis. The chief one quoted by Spitzen is the "Chronicon Windisheimense," in which John Busch calls Thomas author of the "Imitation." This testimony is unimpeachable, since Busch, himself a member of the same congregation as Thomas, was deputed also to be its official historian. John Gerardyn, a member of the Convent of the Holy Apostles at Utrecht (1466) who transcribed the "Chronicon," calls Thomas author of the "Imitation." In every century those scholars who were most competent stood for Thomas; but Abbot Gersen is only a fabricated person. What gave rise to the fabrication, and how it came down to us from the seventeenth century, is so convincingly shown by Spitzen, that further serious dispute we may well consider to be mere waste of time.

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Scuola Cattolica. 28 febbrajo, 1881.

1.—*The Roman Malaria.*

THE *Scuola Cattolica* concludes its treatment of the subject of the Roman Malaria in its February number by replying to the following questions:—1. Is it possible to restore the Agro Romano to a healthy state? 2. Is the malaria chargeable on the Pope-kings? Proof had already been adduced to establish incontrovertibly that the malaria has its origin in physical causes. But are those causes removable, or capable of being counteracted? Upon the answer must depend the question whether or no blame is imputable to the Papal Government, which failed to remove or counteract them. The writer goes on to show that the draining of the Agro, a work frequently attempted unsuccessfully by the Popes, involves a very complicated problem. The higher grounds—all, in short, above the sea level—could be drained, it is true, by means of canals which would draw off the water from all the marshy depressions; but this would effect nothing towards restoring the district to a sanitary state, so long as the great focus of infection remained in the low grounds of the Delta, viz., the accumulation of stagnant and putrescent waters shut in by the sand hills from the sea, and beneath its level. The Commissioners appointed by the present Italian Government, after discussing projects for either emptying or filling up these lagoons, seem to consider that the only plan which recommends itself as feasible under the circumstances is to fill these basins, and thus raise their level above that of the sea. Signor Canevari has calculated that it would require ninety millions of cubic metres of earth for this purpose. A notion of the gigantic nature of such an enterprise may be formed from the fact that this mass would be equivalent to fifty-five mountains of earth, each of them as large as the Vatican Basilica. But whence is it all to

come? Here is the difficulty. One way would be to turn the Tiber into these pools, which would gradually fill them up by its deposits. That is, after all the great antecedent hydraulic preparations have been made, it is computed that fifty years would be required for the process itself. The other idea, which was originally that of P. Secchi, is to transport the soil from hills levelled for the purpose. This could only be done by the aid of steam carriage, which would involve an enormous outlay; but without this it would be folly to think of it. Granting that one or other of these plans would be feasible—and that would be to grant far too much, considering the doubtful language of scientific men, not to speak of the many practical difficulties which would beset its execution, and render its completion extremely problematic—what accusation can be grounded on these hypothetical projects against the Pope-kings for not having hitherto accomplished a work, the very idea of which would be chimerical but for the progress which science has made in our days, both in mechanical and in hydraulic departments, and the discovery of steam power for its application? But such is the common way of dealing with matters where the Popes are concerned; no account is taken of times and seasons, of the circumstances amidst which their lives were cast, or the knowledge and means at their disposal! It appears, moreover, that one or more of the Commissioners regard the project of rendering the Agro Romano salubrious as any way a sheer Utopia, because the malaria exhales, not from these stagnant basins alone, but from many neighbouring marshes—the whole coast from Gaeta to Spezia being of that character more or less. For further reasons of an adverse nature to the successful realization of the work in question, we must refer the reader to the article itself. We think he will conclude that it is rather premature, not to say altogether absurd, to raise a shout of triumph as to the contrast presented between the achievements of revolutionary Italy and those of the preceding Pontifical rule.

2. *The Right of Asylum for Regicides, and the Impotence of Modern Society.* 30 Aprile, 1881.

SINCE the commencement of this century there have been not less than sixty-seven cases of regicide attempted or accomplished. Have these crimes been brought upon sovereigns through their fault, or are they imputable to the wickedness and lawlessness of subjects? Whatever answer may be given to this question—and probably the blame is divisible between the two—certain it is, that regicide in its present form and frequency is a dark product of modern society under the fatal influence of Liberalism. Our European statesmen, moved by the late assassination of the Russian Czar, have been led to a conclusion, long ago obvious to Catholics, viz., that one of the causes of this crime is the abuse of the right of asylum. How, indeed, can any check be put upon it if the culprit finds everywhere a place of refuge? He has not far to go. Belgium and France are often at his service, England always, while Switzerland, occupying a central situation with

respect to the nations which are most disquieted, not only offers a secure retreat, but is itself an active focus of conspiracy. Now, it is in contemplation to agree upon some international law which shall restrict this right of asylum. Will these statesmen succeed? The writer thinks that they will not, and even cannot. Impotence, both political and moral, is against their project. For agreement there must be union. Now the union, if such it can be called, which subsists among the European States is not one of organism, but is the offspring of their mutual jealousy. Suspicious watchfulness of each other is their habitual attitude; there is no uniting bond between them, nothing to form the ground of a common agreement or common action. In this essentially discordant state of things who is to define the right of asylum, and get its limitations accepted? And, above all, where is the sanction of a decision to be sought, without which no stipulation is worth more than the parchment on which it is written? When civil society was not, as now, the society of "progress," but a Christian republic, a common bond of union did exist. There was a law—that of the Church—which commanded universal respect, and there was a common Father of all, a living interpreter and judge of that law, whose sentence often terminated the gravest differences, and was successful in obtaining a homage to justice and right from both prince and people. The so-called Holy Alliance was an abortive attempt at a substitute for the Christian unity of past times with its venerated court of appeal. This device proved an utter failure in either stemming the revolution or preserving the peace of Europe. In the present day the only means of coming to an agreement which the European States possess is diplomacy, with all its arts, its subterfuges, its jealous espionage and duplicity. Regicides will be able to continue their atrocious plots against princes long before diplomacy will be able to lay the first foundation stone of a new international legislation for their protection and that of society.

There might be one way of escape from this political impotence if each State would consent to accept the judicial sentences of the others, so that, when any individual was condemned as a regicide, it would suffice to give authentic notice thereof in order to the delinquent being handed over by the State in which he had sought refuge; in other words, that regicides should be universally condemned, so that the right of asylum should no longer shield from justice a crime so menacing to public peace. But can the modern powers be brought to agree in such a measure? Their moral impotence, which is substantially the root of their political impotence, forbids this agreement. Regicide is, in fact, practically regarded in many of the States as simply a political offence, and under this head it is not considered to come under the conditions of extradition. The writer is, therefore, of opinion that the prevailing corruption of principles will hinder modern society from pronouncing a decision which would place it in the category of murder. Amongst Catholics, of course, there is no question as to the criminality of regicide. No one, be he prince or subject, can be lawfully put to death by private authority; neither is it lawful to kill even

a manifest tyrant, because of the peril of the consequences which ensue to states from such an act. Hence Catholics reckon the murder of a sovereign as a worse crime than an ordinary murder. If, therefore, the European governments were Catholic, all could be satisfactorily provided for, and nothing would be easier than to apprehend the regicide wherever he had taken refuge. Princes may accordingly thank themselves if their death is so often compassed, for it is they who have headed the wicked war against the Church, the only instructor of true principles and the fountain of just laws. But the logic of Liberalism, which they have favoured, leads inexorably to the present appalling state of things. This the writer proceeds ably to demonstrate, but space forbids our following his argument in detail. As an instance of the extreme but logical result of the doctrine of the people's sovereignty, and their indefeasible right, as expressed by a majority—a principle accepted with more or less prominence in all European States except Russia and Turkey—he reminds us of the late amnesty accorded in France to the deported Communists, who had been guilty of the most flagrant and sanguinary deeds, from which measure we are led to deduce that murder, arson, and robbery are no longer judged to be crimes by the French nation if committed during a sedition. But what is to hinder the sovereign people, by the mouth of its representatives, from deciding to-morrow that even that condition is not needed? Regicides are as yet in the minority, but they call themselves the leaders of progress, and confidently assert that the future is theirs. You hang us to-day, they say, but to-morrow we shall have statues erected to us. All Liberal Europe is treading the same path in which France has made such advanced progress, and, had it been possible that the Nihilists should have succeeded and attained to power in Russia, there can be little doubt but that the other governments would have made up their minds to enter into amicable relation with the new administration.

But even as matters stand, and supposing that all were agreed in reckoning regicide to be a crime, our statesmen would have to renounce many other principles beside the indefeasible right of majorities to rule all points, principles which, thanks to them, widely prevail in modern society, before they could succeed in limiting the right of asylum. For instance, the doctrine which they have so largely acted upon, of the end justifying the means, that of accepting accomplished facts; the imposture called non-intervention, devised by Napoleon III., who never acted upon it when it suited his policy to disregard it; but, above all, the intense selfishness and egotism erected into a system under the name of utilitarianism, which makes states regard only their own immediate and narrow interests, would have to be given up. The useful and the expedient have supplanted God and His law. The treaty of Westphalia, which dethroned religion, sanctioned utilitarianism in politics. Crimes had been committed in all ages, but henceforth they were committed on system.

After noticing several other influences at work which would defeat the proposed object, the writer finally alludes to the physical impotence,

as he styles it, which would render its success utterly nugatory, so long as it shall continue to exist. What avails to prosecute the regicide while you train up regicides in your bosom? Take away the causes which form them, or you will be physically impotent against this crime. In one word, it is indispensable to return to God, to Christianity—that is, to true Christianity, which is Catholicism. Society has need of a complete system, and that is to be found only in Catholicism. But if you do not will the means, you never can attain the end; therefore is modern society, in spite of its pride and its boasting, impotent against the crime which dismays it—such is the sentence which it has merited by its many iniquities.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Avril, 1881. Paris.

POPE ALEXANDER VI. is the subject of a long and careful article from the pen of M. Henri de l'Epinois. The subject is a sadly familiar one in controversial and anti-Catholic literature, but the Article is noteworthy in one or two ways. It is a compendious *résumé* of the most recent works, whether expressly on the career of this Pope, or in which it has received any special treatment. Also, it is marked in its tone by great discrimination and freedom from prejudice. Though the writer would rejoice to be called Ultramontane, his Article deliberately lends confirmation to the popular bad opinion of Alexander VI., quite as frequently as it seeks to soften that opinion towards the more favourable, truth. Impartiality, not bias, and zeal entirely guided by respect for historical truth—these qualities marking a truly Catholic study of the life of such a Pontiff, recommend it very powerfully, as likely to promote the cause of our holy religion with earnest enquirers. The saying of Count Joseph de Maistre: "Les Papes n'ont besoin que de la vérité," is gladly accepted by M. de l'Epinois as a motto—it is, indeed, he says, a first principle of their history.

The first thing that may strike a reader who has been accustomed to hear modern Catholic historical writing condemned as one-sided, is, that for unflinching condemnation of this unworthy Pope, and for judgment characterized by what he may have fancied was "Protestant honesty," there is no need to travel beyond the pages of some of our standard Ultramontane authors. The present Cardinal Hergenröther calls him an "immoral and wicked Cardinal," and an "unworthy Pope," whose death "freed Christianity of a great scandal." Only, of course, neither Cardinal Hergenröther nor any other Catholic author argues for the need of impeccability because of infallibility, or confounds the morals of a Pope with his office, or fancies that the Pontiffs of Christ's Church need show otherwise than His apostles did, among whom the crime of Judas in no wise dimmed the glory of the faithful eleven. "The faults" of Alexander VI., writes M. de l'Epinois,

"will not trouble the faith of a Christian. . . . The Church lives in the world, and is served by men subject to all the weaknesses of their time, but the Divine element in her continues unassailable, indefectible; the worst Popes have never opposed to the Faith any decree that could change it. . . . It would seem that the character of infallible vicars of Jesus Christ is resplendent in them with new brilliance. It would appear *natural* that a Pius V. or a Pius IX. should never decree anything contrary to faith or morals, because they would have simply to transfer into words the working of their own pure lives and chaste thoughts; but if a Pope who is the victim of human passions has never altered the truth, in that we have a fact *not* natural, but clearly bespeaking a divine guidance." Thus, whilst the human personality of the Popes may fall a victim, the Divine character stands out the more clearly from the darkness. But, alas, the evil lives of her priests and children is often chastised in their successors. Alexander VI. explains Luther. "History properly studied—the history of Alexander VI. more than any other—is the justification of Divine Providence."

One point to be carefully observed, however, and it is distinctly shown from the best authorities in M. de L'Épinois's article—is that the life of Alexander VI. was by no means so black as it has been painted. "It would appear," says Mr. Rawdon Brown, quoted by the writer, "that history took the Borgia family as a canvas on which to bring together *en tableau* the debaucheries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries." And Alexander VI., culpable doubtless, was made a scapegoat; the passions and spite of his numerous enemies have exaggerated, insinuated, invented against him. Much of the documentary evidence, the writer warns us, contains trustworthy details mixed up with anecdotes exaggerated, or altered, or gratuitously invented. It must not be forgotten how much political rancour mixed itself at that time with religious feeling and judgments, and how unworthy were the lives of the men who grew indignant about a Pope whose fault was to be too much of their own description. So far may this characteristic of society at that time impair the weight of its testimony, so uncertain and difficult of explanation is much of that testimony, that it is by no means impossible to undertake a defence of even Alexander VI. This task, two recent authors, Fathers Ollivier and Leonetti, have confidently attempted. In the dedication of his book to St. Peter, Father Leonetti calls Alexander the "*piu oltraggiato*" of the Apostle's successors. In summing up the result of his long article, M. de l'Épinois says that he cannot accept the conclusions of those—as M. Cerri, Dandolo, Father Ollivier—who have tried to prove that Rodriguez Borgia was legitimately married before he received Orders, or of Father Leonetti, who has transformed the sons of that Cardinal into his nephews; on these points he is of the opinion, which he quotes, of the learned Jesuit editors of the *Civiltà*, that Alexander cannot be justified; "he had several children, four or five after he was bishop and cardinal. one whilst he was Pope." The second and third section of the article where these points are discussed are manifestly the result of wide and

careful reading. But the *public* life of Cardinal Borgia was marked by prudence, zeal, tact, success in the missions confided to him: "Sa vie publique n'a guère mérité que des éloges." The question whether or not his election was simoniacal is fully discussed in Section V. of this Article.

That Cardinal Borgia expended large sums of money, and promised benefices to the Cardinal electors, and that he promised reforms which he never attempted, appears too true; "but he has been accused, without proof, of nameless debaucheries, and of having turned the Vatican into a theatre of horrible orgies." He vigorously pursued the turbulent feudatories of the States of the Church, assuring to the States their modern constitution, a work which Julius II. only completed; but he has been accused without proof of premeditated treasons, and of being the accomplice of assassins. The summary justice of Cæsar Borgia was unfortunately the custom of the time. That which is not doubtful, which was public in the conduct of Alexander VI., truly his *grande passion*, was his desire to aggrandize his children, his nepotism. The accusation that Alexander VI. poisoned the Sultan Djemm, is far from being proved—"n'est nullement prouvée;" neither did he poison Cardinal Orsini, as may be learned from the express testimony of witnesses friendly to the Orsini family. He did much for the spiritual interests of the Church, detailed in section X. M. de l'Épinois promises in a future study to consider the question why, if Alexander was zealous for the reform of the Church, he did not second the efforts of Savonarola. Lastly, was the death of this unfortunate Pope due to poison intended for others? Muratori rejected this as a fable, and new documents have confirmed the justice of his rejection. Alexander died of fever. The suspicions of poison, from the rapid decomposition of his body, point only to effects natural enough in the month of August. These are only assertions—the reader will find in the able article itself seventy pages of proofs and authorities.

Notices of Books.

The Cat; an Introduction to the Study of Backboned Animals, especially Mammals. By ST. GEORGE MIVART, Ph.D., F.R.S. London: John Murray. 1881.

THE cat may be studied from various points of view; but Professor Mivart's large and admirably brought out volume of some 600 pages, is calculated to invest that animal with a respectability which it was hardly suspected to possess. The writer's object, in this monograph, seems to be, to enable those who are not going to be doctors to attain to a thorough acquaintance with anatomy and physiology. That there are many such persons anxious to learn cannot be doubted for a moment. There are numbers of priests, for example, who are well

aware that the more completely they know these two sciences, the more easily and safely do they walk in their professional duties; and no student of metaphysics, whether priest or layman, can afford to overlook the questions raised by materialistic writers in reference to brain, nerve and tissue, or to despise the assistance which modern investigations offer in determining the relations between spirit and body. Non-professional students of man's anatomy—that is to say, all but those who are studying for the medical profession—have hitherto been too effectually deterred by the supposed necessity of attending dissections of the human subject in a public dissecting room. Priests, especially, have naturally found it to be out of the question to mix with medical students and attend demonstrations in a public hall. This is the reason why Professor Mivart has chosen the Cat.

A fresh description of human anatomy is not required, and would be comparatively useless for those for whom the work is especially intended. For a satisfactory study of animals (or of plants) can only be carried on by their direct examination—the knowledge to be obtained from reading being supplemented by dissection. This, however, as regards man, can only be practised in medical schools. Moreover, the human body is so large that its dissection is very laborious, and it is a task, generally at first unpleasing, to those who have no special reason for undertaking it. But this work is intended for persons who are interested in zoology, and especially in the zoology of beasts, birds, reptiles and fishes, and not merely for those concerned in studies proper to the medical profession (Pref. viii.).

Cats are easily to be had; they are not too large; and they are so sufficiently like man, as to limbs and other larger portions of the frame, that almost all the advantages to be gained from human dissection may be obtained by the dissection of the cat. This volume, indeed, is intended as an introduction to the natural history of the whole group of backboneed animals; we have definitions of all needful terms, and all those explanations which an introductory handbook is expected to afford, combined with that vividness of illustration which results from studying these things in a concrete example.

With the technical part of this most opportune book we shall not be expected to concern ourselves deeply. We have chapters on form, skin, skeleton, muscles, on the alimentary and nervous systems, the organs of respiration and circulation, and all the other subjects connected with physiology proper as exemplified in the cat. It may be observed, however, that Professor Mivart has dealt with the technicalities of his subject in so clear and intelligible a fashion that the non-professional reader will not find it difficult to follow him. If we turn, for instance, to chapter vii., on the cat's organs of circulation, we find a readable and useful account of the blood, the arteries, the veins, the heart, &c. In the chapter on respiration we find it easy to understand all about the voice and its production. Under the nervous system we learn the structure of the eye, and so on. But this book, besides being an excellent hand-book for a student of physiology, is also the production of a philosophic writer who has thought much on

most of those higher problems which are now being discussed on all sides under the heads of psychology, descent and development. It will be recognized by all instructors of Catholic youth, and by students themselves, that it is no common advantage to have a first-class textbook of physiology, written by a Catholic writer who has already won from the public the privilege of being listened to even on questions of far higher import. The chapter entitled, the Psychology of the Cat, contains, under a title which may astonish some and amuse a few, a most valuable and original lesson on the distinction between the mental powers of even the highest animals and the intellectual gifts of man. The author had already treated the subject at length in his "Lessons from Nature," from the fourth chapter to the seventh; and to those who have read that thoughtful work there is not so much in this chapter which is new. The list of the different kinds of language is repeated; but, on the other hand, we have a much more extended list of the various "powers" which exist in man and in the brutes. Professor Mivart sums up the cat's active powers under eighteen heads, among which he includes what he terms "organic inference" and "organic volition." "Organic inference," he defines as the power "of so reviving complex imaginations, upon the occurrence of sensations and images, as to draw practical consequences." It is obvious that it is the use of the words "inference" and "drawing of consequences" which has to be guarded and explained. The problem is, to admit that the animal sees a *consequent* without seeing the *consequence*. As there is, without doubt, an insuperable difficulty in forcing new terms into the language, we presume no attempt can be made to establish a double set of terms for "knowledge," the one expressing what is known by sense without intellect, the other by intellect making use of sense. Under these circumstances, perhaps, Professor Mivart's expression "organic inference," or "drawing practical inferences"—though the phrases somewhat startle a scholastic—need not be objected to. His explanation is extremely clear and well put. He says :—

All the actions performed by the cat are such as may be understood to take place without deliberation or self-consciousness. For such action it is necessary, indeed, that the animal should sensibly cognize external things, but it is not necessary that it should intellectually perceive their being; that it should feel itself existing, but not recognize that existence; that it should feel relations between objects, but not that it should apprehend them as relations; that it should remember, but not intentionally seek to recollect; that it should feel and express emotions, but not itself advert to them; that it should seek the pleasurable, but not that it should make the pleasurable its deliberate aim (p. 373).

In fact, as he adds, all the mental phenomena displayed by the cat are capable of explanation without drawing at all upon that list of peculiarly "human" gifts which Professor Mivart gives on the preceding page. This, we consider, is the true way in which to meet the men who are always bringing up cases of miraculous dogs and reasoning cats. The question is, can these actions, which every one admits

to have an outward resemblance to actions which man would do under similar circumstances, be explained without calling in reason proper, or the abstractive and universalizing power? If they can—and we maintain they can—then they are of no weight whatever in proving that the mental powers of man and brute differ only in degree, and not in kind. Professor Mivart enforces his views by the consideration of the question of language. He enters at some length into the question of what the soul of an animal is. He considers that there is innate in every living organism below man, a distinct, substantial, immaterial entity, subsisting (of course) indivisibly. This he calls the *Psyche*—soul, or form. The animal soul has no actual existence apart from the matter which it vivifies. Yet it is the animal, *par excellence*; the matter of which the animal is composed being but “the subordinate part” of that compound but indissoluble unity—the living animal. And as the soul of the living creature has no separate existence from the matter in which it energizes, so when that material envelope, or rather, sphere of occupancy, is dissolved (by death) the “soul” ceases to exist at all. This is Thomistic teaching pure and simple. Professor Mivart even uses the word “form;” though it will be observed how skilfully he translates scholastic technicalities into modern English. He does not pursue the subject as far as some of his readers would have desired; he does not inquire whence comes the “psyche” of an animal, and whither it goes. The distinguished Dominican Professor, Dr. A. Lepidi, of Louvain, is of opinion that the souls of animals are produced immediately by divine interference in each case, either having been created all simultaneously, when the world was made, or being provided at conception, as soon as the body is sufficiently organized to receive them. His reason for this supposition appears to be the difficulty of every other hypothesis. “Matter,” he says, quoting St. Thomas of Aquin, “cannot produce the immaterial.” This idea of perpetual creation will, to many, appear unnatural. Does God interfere with his creative power whenever a fly is born, or an insect of an hour begins its brief existence? But the truth is, that this “interference” is universal, and is not exceptional or miraculous, but law and Nature. Everything that exists—presuming everything to be a composite—seems (to judge by effects) to have a “form” quite different from the resultant of its mechanical elements. Men of science deny this; but we are coming back to it again. These “forms” do not exist in Nature, apart or tangible. They seem: to come in, to spring out, to be set up, at the moment matter is organized or prepared in a certain fashion. Similarly, at a certain step in the process of dissolution, they disappear and recede into non-existence. If it be thus with chemical forces, and with plants, much more truly is it so with beings whose operations, being immaterial, demand an immaterial “form” or principle. So that animals, plants, and even the rocks and the water, begin to be by a sort of “creation”—the sudden bursting into being of a potent energy which was waiting undeveloped in those same recesses whence came the world itself. These energies die out as they come. In spite of the ingenious speculation of

Balmez, that the souls of animals are not destroyed, but are used again and again for the "information" of fresh materials, it seems more true to the scheme of Nature to say they disappear. Their production is not creation proper, if we reserve the word creation either for the production of things without pre-existing conditions, or for the production of the image and likeness of the Maker; and neither is their dissolution annihilation.

In his concluding chapter on the "Pedigree and Origin of the Cat," Professor Mivart repeats and enforces those views on Natural Selection and on Origin which he has so ably developed in his "Genesis of Species." His conclusion is well known. He admits that "environment," and "surrounding agencies," and "indefinite tendencies," have had much to do with development; but he insists that an *internal force* or "form," or soul, has played the chief part in the world's transformations.

The idea of an *internal force* is a conception which we cannot escape if we would adhere to the teaching of Nature. If, in order to escape it, we were to consent to regard the instincts of animals as exclusively due to the conjoint action of their environment and their physical needs, to what should we attribute the origin of their physical needs—their desire for food and safety, and their sexual instincts? If, for argument's sake, we were to grant that these needs were the mere result of the active powers of the cells which compose their tissues, the question but returns—Whence had these cells their active powers, their aptitudes and needs? And, if by a still more absurd concession, we should grant that these needs and aptitudes are the mere outcome of the physical properties of their ultimate material constituents, the question still again returns, and with redoubled force. That the actual world we see about us should ever have been possible, its very first elements must have possessed those definite essential natures, and have had implanted in them those internal laws and innate powers which reason declares to be necessary to account for the subsequent outcome. We must then, after all, concede at the end as much as we need have conceded at the outset of the inquiry (p. 525).

The book may be earnestly recommended, both as an admirable textbook and as a clear, sound, and courageous exposition of philosophical principle on matters regarding which every educated Catholic is bound to be fairly informed.

The Pulpit Commentary. Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. SPENCER, M.A., and the Rev. JOSEPH S. EXELL. Genesis and 1 Samuel, 2 vols. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

WE presume that by a "Pulpit Commentary" is meant a commentary intended especially for the use of preachers. Now preachers do not want long dissertations on roots and readings; they want the results rather than the processes of critical discussion. They look for a concise explanation of the Scripture text, with such comments as may best help them to adapt it to popular instruction. Suggestive thoughts, spiritual maxims, apt illustrations, pithy sayings of the Fathers, telling anecdotes—these form the concentrated food for which the preacher yearns; the milk and water can be easily obtained.

Judging of the present work by the volumes which have yet appeared, it fails to fulfil the special requirements of a Preacher's Commentary. The exposition of the text is certainly the best part. A great deal of matter is there condensed into a very small compass. But the greater part of the work is made up of what are called homiletics and homilies, a distinction by no means clear, or uniformly understood by the various contributors. These consist mainly of sermon notes and plans of sermons; in other words, of homiletical matter in different stages of preparation, from the highly wrought period to the merest outline. Of solid dogmatic teaching there is scarcely a trace; but of vague Christianity, and virtue in general, there is more than enough. Platitude is heaped on platitude, and the whole mass endlessly divided and sub-divided. Let any one read but a few pages of these bulky volumes and he will understand what Sydney Smith meant by "being preached to death." There is more real suggestiveness in one chapter of "Cornelius à Lapide" than in a whole volume of the "Pulpit Commentary." Then, owing to its defective plan, the work when completed will be too large and too dear for any but the benefited preachers of a well-endowed Church. There is not much of the old "No Popery" style, once so dear to Protestant preachers. Perhaps this may explain the intellectual poverty of the homiletical portion, for it used to be said of most Protestant preachers that unless they denounced the Pope they would have nothing to say. Still the old feeling must find expression, be it ever so feeble. Catholic commentators are called Popish writers. One homilist, *d'propos* of Saul's kingship, exclaims—

What a calamity it has been to the Latin Church to have an alleged vicar of Christ on earth! The arrangement quite falls in with the craving for a spiritual ruler who may be seen, and the uneasiness of really unspiritual men under the control of One who is invisible. So there is a Popedom, which began indeed with good intentions and impulses, as did the monarchy of Saul, but has long ago fallen under God's displeasure through arrogance, and brought nothing but confusion and oppression on Christendom. We are a hundred times better without such a vicegerent. Enough in the spiritual sphere that the Lord is king (1 Samuel, p. 243).

But perhaps the most offensive thing to Catholics is the constant iteration of the heresy of justification by faith only, in passages which look as if they had been borrowed from the Tract Society. For instance,—

The root of a Christian life is belief in a finished redemption; not belief that the doctrine is true, but trust in the fact as the one ground of hope. Hast thou entered on God's call; entered the ark; trusted Christ; none else, nothing else? Waitest thou for something in thyself? Noah did not think of fitness when told to enter. God calleth thee as unfit. Try to believe; make a real effort (Genesis, p. 147).

The Book of Job : a Metrical Translation, with Introduction and Notes.

By H. J. CLARKE, A.K.C. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

THIS is a devout and painstaking effort to make the full beauty of this divine poem more apparent to English readers. The translation is made directly from the Hebrew, and the rhythmical parts

are set in blank verse. Whether this is any real advantage is doubtful. In metrical translations, gain in rhythm is often compensated by loss in accuracy. Nor is Mr. Clarke's blank verse very poetical. He is too fond of long words and stilted phrases—*e.g.*, "vociferate thy plaint," "adumbrates," &c. The prose of the authorized version is sometimes more poetical than Mr. Clarke's verse; as for instance, in the oft-quoted description of death,—“Where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest,” (ch. iii. v. 17)—rendered by Mr. Clarke thus,—“The wicked there desist from raging, and the weary rest.” On the other hand it must be admitted that through the help of modern scholarship a more intelligible rendering is given to some of the obscurer passages. The work of the miner in the twenty-eighth chapter is thus described,—

Thus man has put
An end to darkness, and extends his search
Far down to depths remote, in quest of stone,
In gloom enshrouded and death's shade concealed.
Down from the region where abodes are found
He digs a shaft. Forgotten by the foot
That treads above them, there the miners swing:
Remote from men, they dangle to and fro.
From out the earth then comes forth sustenance (pp. 67, 68).

One great fault in Mr. Clarke's translation is that he spoils Job's prophecy of the Bodily Resurrection by rendering the twenty-sixth verse (ch. xix.) “and, from my flesh *released*, shall I see God.” In a note he defends himself, on the ground that the literal translation is “from my flesh.” Yet the context shows that this phrase, though ambiguous in itself, must here mean “in my flesh,” for it goes on to speak of the eyes of his flesh. And as Dr. Pusey says, “unless he had meant emphatically to assert that he should *from his flesh behold God* after his body had been dissolved, the addition of ‘from my flesh’ had been not merely superfluous but misleading. For the obvious meaning is ‘from out of my flesh,’ as the versions show.”* Nor is it satisfactory to find that Mr. Clarke thinks that the author was Hesron, the Ezzrahite, in the time of Solomon, thus ignoring all that Prof. Lee has done to prove the extreme antiquity of the book.

A Handbook to Political Questions of the Day. Being the Arguments on Either Side. By SIDNEY C. BUXTON. London: J. Murray. 1880.

THE author has ranged under such headings as “Disestablishment,” “Compulsory Education,” “Ballot,” “Permissive Bill,” the main arguments that have been advanced *pro* or *con*. By argument he understands what logicians call middle-term; his book is, in fact, a repertory of middle terms to which the statesman may refer when composing his speech, or by help of which the student may see at a glance the pith of the contention on either side, and thus more

* “Lectures on Daniel,” p. 509.

effectually form an estimate of the merits of the question. No opinion is expressed on the merits of any question; nothing is given but the bare argument of advocate and opponent, evidently stated with the utmost brevity; a short introduction, giving statistical or historical information necessary to a proper understanding of the topics, is all the author allows himself in addition. There can be little doubt that the book will be useful; it will save much hurried searching through past parliamentary and other speeches, and it supplies as much explanatory matter as will perhaps just save a speaker, pressed for time and forgetful or ignorant, from betraying in his speech either ignorance or a bad memory. But the information is too scant to put one *au courant* on the questions it treats, and even the arguments are most often stated so briefly that to see their full bearing on the point requires special knowledge and trained habits of reasoning. A quotation of one or two arguments, as they are here stated, will readily and sufficiently acquaint the reader with the character of this volume.

The proposal [to withdraw all religious teaching from Board Schools] is supported on the grounds:—1. (By some) that it is beyond the province of the State to recognize any religious teaching. 2. (By others) that, though the State may recognize religious teaching, it may not use the nation's money in encouraging the teaching of that which part of the nation objects to or disbelieves. 3. That the necessary religious teaching can be given out of school hours, and in Sunday schools.

Some other reasons follow, and then the grounds are stated on which the present permissive power of giving unsectarian religious teaching is upheld. Three of these are given, chosen not consecutively but chiefly for their brevity.

3. That the State ought not to hold aloof from all recognition of religious teaching.

5. That the religious scruples of all are protected by the Conscience Clause.

7. That religious hatreds are softened by the system of bringing children of different denominations under one common religious teaching.

The aim of the author, to be perfectly impartial in the statement of opposite views, has apparently been kept in view throughout; on this score little fault can be found. But there is not, as has been said, sufficient fulness of detail and explanation—only, in fact, enough to make one conscious how extremely valuable a fuller "Handbook" on the same lines would really be.

Since this notice was written we observe that a second, and now a third, edition of this Handbook have been published, each containing an addition of "subjects" that have successively risen into importance—among those of the third edition being the "three F's." There is evidently a greater demand for such a book than the brief and undeveloped character of its contents would have led us to anticipate. At the same time, if such a Handbook is to keep abreast of the pressing need there should be at least a yearly edition.

A Bygone Oxford. By FRANCIS GOLDIE, S.J. London : Burns and Oates. Oxford : Thomas Shrimpton and Son. 1881.

TO many persons a period spent in Oxford has supplied all the remainder of their lives with, at least, a perception of what is elevated and romantic, in which they might otherwise have been deficient. There are, of course, those to whom their prospects in the schools, as there are others to whom the sports of their age and of the place, are so simply absorbing, that the noble objects by which they are surrounded are passed by unheeded. But this must surely be a rare case, and, if we may judge of the amount of the appetite by the amount of the pabulum provided, interest in material Oxford has not been wanting since the beginning of this century, and is now fairly at its height. That in the regard paid to Oxford, as in all attempts at art appreciation by so inartistic a people as ourselves, there should be much blundering, was to be expected. What with the neo-Classic and the neo-Gothic, the Oxford of William of Wykeham and William of Waynflete is sadly overlaid, and the literary expositors of Oxford constrain themselves to speak with respect of such very dissimilar structures as the venerable fame of St. Frideswide, the tower of Magdalen, the spire of All Saints, the library of Oriel, the Taylor building, and the University Museum. With some, Oxford is enveloped in a sort of nebulous haze with a landscape fore-ground, and the salient features of the place are dissolved into some such chance-medley as the poet's *mise-en-scène* :—

A Gothic ruin and a Grecian house,
A talk of college and of ladies' rights,
A feudal knight in silken masquerade !

We have often pleased ourselves by fancying what form a work on Catholic Oxford would assume—a work that should by its very nature exclude the pedantry and mannerism with which the worshippers of Laud on the one hand, and of Arnold on the other, have surrounded the subject of this far-famed university, and that should moreover be free from the dilly-dallying of the merely Picturesque school. It was therefore with much interest that we met in a room in Oxford some two years back the very persons who seemed best fitted for the execution of such a task, and the hope sprang up in our mind that the desire we had long entertained was about to find its fulfilment. An important instalment is presented in Father Goldie's work entitled "*A Bygone Oxford*," which is full and satisfactory for the ground it covers—the history and antiquities of the monastic foundations. Even upon the theme of the existing establishments, Father Goldie's work enters. St. Frideswide's is now Christ Church; the Benedictine Gloucester Hall, Worcester College; the Cistercian St. Bernard's, St. John's College. Durham College, the feeder in Oxford of the great northern monastery, as re-founded in Queen Mary's time by Sir Thomas Pope, of Tittenhanger, under the name of Trinity, is a very interesting link between the ancient and modern colleges, and as the first home of Cardinal Newnan in the university, has in the present century esta-

blished a fresh title to fame. On the other hand, Osney Abbey, which belonged—as did St. Frideswide's—to the Canons Regular, has utterly perished; so has Cistercian Rewley, to the indignation of good old Dr. Johnson, as recorded by the faithful Boswell, who also witnessed the displeasure of the Sage at the wreck of the cathedral and monasteries of St. Andrews. The great French Dominican, Lacordaire, speaks finely of the preservation of the reliques of antiquity at Oxford. But Father Goldie leads us, where we have often trod unbidden, through sordid St. Ebbe's, to view the site of the Dominican monastery, which, like its Franciscan neighbour, has altogether disappeared. We see that a contemporary twits Father Goldie with bringing Henry the Eighth upon the stage as a modern Philistine. So far is he from doing so, that the only comparisons he institutes are with Herod and Nero, the ancient monarchs whom he resembled, except, indeed, as he out-Heroded them in the number of his victims. Father Goldie's work is an excellent one, and will, we hope, meet with the success it deserves. One or two minor points we have noted for correction. The stained glass window, with a figure of Bp. King, and a representation of Osney, is not in the north but in the south aisle of Christ Church. The "Thomas" in the last line of page 16 is a very evident misprint for "William." It is awkwardly said on page 11, that the Lady Chapel of Osney "was projected at the east end" where "projected" (simply) is the meaning. Father Goldie says in his concluding sentence, that sorrow must come uppermost in the mind of his readers. St. Augustine speaks in his Confessions of the worthlessness and mischief of theatrical representations that excite to sorrow merely, and not to the relief of the suffering portrayed. But as the disastrous spoliation and confiscation and destruction recorded by Father Goldie really happened, we trust that his readers may be stirred up to aid, by every means in their power, the cause of the Church in Oxford, as the proper reparation for the outrages of the kings and nobles, and consenting Commons, of former days. Thus it shall not be said of them: "Non . . . ad subveniendum provocatur auditor, sed tantum ad dolendum incitatur."

Della Vita di Antonio Rosmini-Serbatì. Memorie di Francesco Paoli, Ditta G. B. Paravia e Comp. Roma, Torino, &c. 1880.

A LIFE of the eminent servant of God and great genius, Father Antonio Rosmini, was absolutely required. We have one here, at last, though it is still in a foreign idiom. Rosmini was a man who feared God alone, and who lived at a time when there was much to stir up the wrath of an honest heart in the land of his birth. He has spoken many bold and remarkable words, and it is no wonder if he, and his philosophy, and his Institute, have had much to contend against. This Life, and the important and elaborate work "*Degli Universale secondo la teoria Rosminiana*," by Bishop Ferré, of which we have received three volumes, and an interesting volume of "*Conferenze sui doveri ecclesiastici*," by the founder himself (Speirani

e figli, Torino, 1880), will make it more easy to estimate his work, his character, and his teaching. To this we hope to return at no distant date. Meanwhile the *Life* before us is modestly and elegantly written, is very complete, and very well put together. We hope it may find a translator.

The Lusiad of Camoens. Translated into English Spenserian Verse by ROBERT FFRENCH DUFF. Lisbon : Lewtas. London : Chatto and Windus. 1880.

MR. FFRENCH DUFF'S translation was begun, he tells us, when he was "fast approaching his seventieth year" as a solace and occupation in hours of leisure from business. Under these singular circumstances it is impossible not to admire the writer's literary taste and perseverance, and it is difficult not to speak leniently of shortcomings in a work thus accomplished. If we state that Mr. Ffrench Duff's translation has little chance of superseding in public estimation that of Mr. Aubertin, or even that of Mr. Mickle, we are encouraged to be thus outspoken by the writer's own courageous assertion: "Should my labours meet with a cold reception from the public (and I am very far from entertaining any great expectation), I shall be amply rewarded and consoled by the pleasure which they have afforded me." The Spenserian form of verse is what distinguishes this translation of the "*Lusiad*;" but it appears to us that just because of the choice of this form, the translation is not so successful as it might otherwise have been. The unity of the stanza has apparently led the writer into frequent verbiage and weakening prolixity, whilst a want of care about grammatical construction often adds obscurity thereto. There are frequent changes of nominative and of tense, with the object doubtless of securing rhymes, but often to the detriment of clearness. A short extract will afford one example of where Mr. Ffrench Duff, who professes to be more literal in his translation than was Mr. Mickle, has failed to bring out the image (an image taken from the favourite bull-fight) of the original with nearly Mickle's success. But the real poetic fire, the terseness and vigour of the latter translator more than compensate for the drawback that he is not very faithful. We set his translation in juxta-position rather than any other, because it is likely long and deservedly to remain the popular one. His additions, too, are no great offence, when they are distinguished, as they are in the excellent edition in Bohn's library, by being set in italics.

So when a joyful lover, from the ring
All stained with blood, espies a lovely dame
To whom his ardent hopes and wishes cling,
And the rage of the bull has for his aim
With runs, signs, jumps and shouting to inflame;
At bay, the furious brute looks proudly round,
With eyelids closed by wrath, and quivering frame,
He clears the space, at one tremendous bound,
His foe he wounds, gores, slays and tramples on the ground.

The gunners in the boats now open fire
 With steady aim from all their dreadful guns,
 The leaden bullets scatter ruin dire,
 The cannon's loud report rebounds, and stuns;
 Throughout the Moorish ranks cold terror runs,
 And chills the blood, for well they know the die
 Is cast for all, but each the danger shuns;
 From certain death the men in ambush fly
 Whilst those who show themselves remain to fight and die.

(Duff's Translation, Canto I, p. 32.)

Thus, when to gain his beauteous charmer's smile,
 The youthful lover dares the bloody toil,
 Before the nodding bull's stern front he stands,
 He leaps, he wheels, he shouts, and waves his hands :
 The lordly brute disdains the stripling's rage,
 His nostrils smoke, and, eager to engage,
 His hornèd brows he levels with the ground,
 And shuts his flaming eyes, and wheeling round
 With dreadful bellowing rushes on the foe,
 And lays the boastful gaudy champion low.
 Thus to the sight the sons of *Lusus* sprung,
 Nor slow to fall their ample vengeance hung :
 With sudden roar the carabines resound,
 And bursting echoes from the hills rebound ;
 The lead flies hissing through the trembling air,
 And death's fell dæmons through the flashes glare, &c.

(Mickle's Translation, Book I. p. 23. Edit. Bell & Sons, 1877.)

Politicians of To-day ; a Series of Personal Sketches. By T. WEMYSS REID. In Two Volumes. London : Griffith & Farran. 1880.

THESE Sketches are somewhat too sketchy for the dignity of a two-volume book. They were written originally for the columns of a provincial newspaper, to supply that "personal" information that curiosity now so urgently asks about great or notorious people ; and this fact explains the thinness of style. Mr. Reid professes that he writes as a Liberal, but with an endeavour "to be just to all, and ungenerous to none." This is no doubt the case ; but in such chatty sketches as these, where there is a large quantity of sentiment and rhetoric, and comparatively little acute criticism or fact, and the latter entirely as seen from a special point of view, there is as much that we dissent from as that we agree with. But of the writer's honesty and desire to be fair we have proof enough. His sketch of Prince Bismarck is far more reserved than that of M. Gambetta, the latter being, indeed, a picture of effulgent brightness, in which the recognition of errors is only as the recognition of spots on the sun. Of course the sketches of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield stand in sharp contrast, but even the latter is measured and fair in comparison with such "liberal" estimates as the biography by Mr. T. P. O'Connor. On what principle of selection the subjects of these sketches have been chosen is not apparent. They contain the Prince of Wales,

"Punch," and "The Speaker" of the House, and a score of English politicians, from the Prime Minister down to such men as Mr. Edward Jenkins and Mr. Parnell; but of notable foreign names we have only Gambetta, Bismarck, and Gortschakoff. In the sketch of Mr. Parnell there is an estimate of Obstructionism that we have not seen before, and our readers will doubtless forgive the length of the extract. Mr. Reid wrote, it should be remembered, in October, 1879, but even then he regarded "systematic obstruction as one of the gravest of all offences," warned Mr. Parnell that his is "a game at which two can play," and severely censured his extra-Parliamentary utterances.

It must be something of a shock to the stranger who enters the House of Commons imbued with these ideas, to find that these redoubtable Obstructives, in outward manner and appearance, do not differ very greatly from their most respectable colleagues on the Conservative benches. They are not armed either with the national shillelagh or the transatlantic revolver; they do not wear their hats akimbo, like some worthy gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House; and if you have occasion to speak to them, you need not tremble for your safety. There is not one among them who will not give you a very civil answer to any legitimate inquiry you may address to him. The stranger therefore, need not feel nervous if fortune should bring him into close proximity to Mr. Parnell or Mr. O'Donnell. They are by no means so black as they have been painted. They may bark, it is true, but they never bite—except in a strictly Parliamentary or Pickwickian fashion. Having got rid of his fears on this point, the visitor, whose mind has been filled with pictures derived from the London correspondence of Tory newspapers, probably finds himself greatly bewildered by what he sees and hears during a debate. It is an Obstructive debate, and to-morrow morning it will be described in the Parliamentary reports as "Another Scene," whilst able editors and indignant descriptive writers in the Reporters' Gallery will enlarge upon the enormity of the conduct of Messrs. Parnell and Co. Yet this is what the intelligent stranger actually sees of the "scene" in question:—A gentleman rises from his seat below the gangway on the Opposition side of the House, and in mild and measured accents, slightly flavoured with the suspicion of a brogue, calls attention to an undoubted defect in a clause of the Bill under discussion. It is, let us suppose, a measure affecting the colonies. "Will the Right Hon. Baronet, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, kindly explain to me the meaning of this clause, which appears to be drawn in very vague and ambiguous language?" There is nothing in this simple question that seems calculated to provoke anybody to anger; yet no sooner has it fallen from the lips of the speaker, than a prolonged shout of "Oh!" rises from a hundred throats on the Tory side of the House. Amid this shout, a tall gentleman rises from the Treasury Bench, and in a very testy, if not positively insulting, fashion, tells his interrogator that he cannot answer his question. His manner, if not his words, conveys the idea that none but a fool could have put such an inquiry, and that it is beneath the dignity of a Minister to pay any attention to it. There is a roar of cheering from the Conservative side, amidst which the Colonial Secretary drops into his seat with a supercilious smile upon his face. The cheers change into howls when the gentleman who asked the question gets up again. For a few moments the disorder is so great that he cannot be heard. "Order, order!" cries the Chairman, in measured tones; and there is a slight diminution in the noise, during which the

Obstructionist—for this bland, gentlemanly personage positively belongs to that terrible body—manages to utter a single sentence. “Order, order!” again cries the Chairman, and he follows up the words by rising to his feet. Instantly, according to the rules of the House, the person who is speaking must sit down and wait the presidential deliverance. “I must point out to the hon. Member,” says Mr. Raikes, in his most dignified manner, “that he is not in order in referring to a question which is not at this moment before the Committee.” Loud Ministerial cheering greets this declaration. Again the Obstructionist rises, and essays to speak. “But, sir—” he says, and then such a storm of jibes, yells, and groans burst forth from the crowded benches opposite to him, that there is no possibility of the rest of his sentence being heard. “Sir, I rise to order,” cries a Tory, who springs to his feet evidently in a state of suppressed fury, and again the unfortunate Obstructive has to sit down. “I wish to know, sir,” pursues the new comer, “whether the hon. gentleman has accepted your ruling, sir?” And again the war-cry goes forth from the Conservative side. Now, however, it is caught up by answering cheers from the Home Rulers. Amid the tumult, the Obstructive once more rises. “Sir, I am not aware that I have disputed your ruling, but I wish to observe—” It is all in vain. Yells of “Withdraw, withdraw,” ring through the House. The unfortunate speaker grows red in the face, and at last shouts out a demand to know whether he may not be allowed to finish his sentence. “No!” comes in a stentorian voice from a seat immediately behind the Ministerial bench. Then up springs another Obstructive, who has been infected by the general excitement, and who, in a voice tremulous with passion, calls upon the Chairman to protect the speaker from unparliamentary interruptions. And so the scene goes on for five or ten or even twenty minutes, until the storm ceases as suddenly as it began, and it is found that it has all been based upon a misunderstanding; that the Obstructive never used the words which the Chairman thought he heard him use, and that consequently he has never been out of order at all.

This is scarcely an exaggerated description of one of these so-called “scenes” with the Obstructives. That those Members who belong to the little party, have been guilty of many most foolish and unjustifiable actions, cannot, I think, be denied; but nothing is more certain than that the manner in which they are habitually treated by Conservative Members is the cause of no small part of that obstruction of business, the whole responsibility for which is laid upon their shoulders. I have no call to defend Mr. Parnell and his comrades (vol. ii. p. 253).

Turkish Armenia and Eastern Asia Minor. By the Rev. HENRY FANSHAWE TOZER, M.A., F.R.G.S. London: Longman, Green, and Co. 1881.

THIS very interesting volume of travels has a double claim to notice: it is from the pen of a scholar and an experienced traveller—one who has learned to observe and to write down of his observations just what gives interest and profit to the general reader. And further, Mr. Tozer sailed from Constantinople for Asiatic Turkey in July, 1879, little more than a year after England had undertaken the “Eastern Protectorate.” A report, therefore, from such an observer concerning the state of the country itself, and of the peoples inhabiting Asia Minor and Armenia, made at such a moment, must excite interest.

How far is the rule of Turkey over those once historical nations of Asia Minor "oppressive and corrupt?" What do the peoples themselves think—if they care at all—about English protection? But there is still another cause of interest attaching to the localities over which Mr. Tozer travelled—that of religion. At the present day, what is the condition of Mahometanism and of Christianity among Turks, Greeks, Armenians, Kurds, and other intermixed nationalities? On all these topics the author has something to say that is worth hearing; and on the subject of religion is fair, and free from the stupid bias and the unquestioning assumption of superiority that characterize too many English travellers.

It would appear that no small amount of courage, or at least of determination, was needful to carry Mr. Tozer beyond the merely first step in his projected tour. The French Consul, then acting for England, at Samsoun assured him that the roads were "thoroughly unsafe, owing to the Circassians and other brigands." The same story met him in nearly every place, whilst a former traveller through Asiatic Turkey told him before he started, "You will find less to eat than in European Turkey, and more things that will eat you." Mr. Tozer, however, was neither robbed nor eaten, and returned to give his readers a trip scarcely less pleasant than his own.

At Amasia the pasha told Mr. Tozer that out of 15,000 men of that district who had gone to the Russo-Turkish war, only one in ten had returned. The same story was told him elsewhere. From the same pasha he first heard that representatives of England were coming to all great towns of the interior in Asia Minor and Armenia. Many of these he met—military men always—and he thus expresses in clear terms his conviction concerning them:—

Such men must always be of service in a country like Turkey, for their presence is a protest against wrongdoing, and they are feared for their uprightness and their power of reporting misdeeds at head-quarters. The only misfortune connected with their appointment was the circumstance under which it was made, for, following as it did in the wake of the assumption by England of a protectorate of the Asiatic provinces of Turkey, it gave rise to the most exaggerated expectations on the part of the natives. . . . Abuses it was thought were soon to come to an end and a period of prosperity to begin. Of course these hopes were doomed to disappointment as soon as it was found that the English officials had no administrative functions whatsoever (p. 31).

Anatolia is described as a "very rich and productive land," fine crops, necessities of life cheap; "almost anything might be made of it under a good Government." Government far from good, however; justice venal—decisions going to highest bidders; taxes heavy; pashas usually corrupt, often ignorant, buying their office of the Grand Vizier, and often changed—three of them in the year, some years, in Amasia (one of the most important *sandjaks* in Turkey), each comer having ousted his predecessor by overbidding.

The whole population was now thoroughly disgusted with the Government, so much so that all of them, the Turks included, would gladly

welcome any European Power that would step in. Towards Russia especially there was an excellent feeling, mainly owing to the favourable treatment of the Turkish prisoners during their detention in that country. Those who returned said: "The Russians fed us well, and gave us good clothes and boots; they are the very people to suit us as governors." Were it not for the long-standing feeling of goodwill towards England, they would all go over to the side of Russia. I give this information as the result of the observation of intelligent residents. Part of it we had afterwards, in some degree, to correct, and the condition of the people was certainly represented in too favourable colours; but, on the other hand, some of its most startling statements we had occasion ourselves to verify (p. 42).

This leaning towards Russia is several times manifested to Mr. Tozer in villages and towns of Asia Minor: in Armenia he was frequently told "the hopes of the Armenians are now fixed on England." We must be content to merely indicate Mr. Tozer's excellent descriptions of Kaiserieh; of his ascent and circuit of Mount Argæus; of the monastic rock-dwellings and rock-hewn churches of Gueremeh, where "the whole valley had once been the abode of a vast monastic community;" of the Armenian monasteries of Surp Garabed (St. John the Baptist), near Kaiserieh at one end of his route, and near Mush at the other. The latter, named also Changelî, or "the place of bells," "occupies a small table of ground, with steep slopes both above and below it, at a height of 6,000 feet above the sea." We had intended to quote his glowing descriptions of Mount Ararat, as seen by him some thirty miles off from a ridge, itself eight or nine thousand feet high; his account of the Kurds, their villages and religion; and finally his visit to the monastery of Sumelas, of which there is a very suggestive wood engraving—but readers will not regret going to Mr. Tozer's volume for them.

Demonology and Devil-Lore. By MONCURE DANIEL CONWAY, M.A.
Second Edition. Two Vols. London: Chatto and Windus. 1880.

UNLESS it were for the purpose of airing his large acquaintance with Sanskrit and Oriental literatures, or of both puzzling and tiring his readers, we cannot see why Mr. Conway has devoted two large volumes to prove his thesis.

It has been my purpose (he says) to follow the phantasms which man has conjured up from obstacles encountered in his progressive adaptation to the conditions of existence on his planet. These obstacles, at first mainly physical, have been imaginatively associated with preternatural powers so long as they were not comprehended by intelligence or mastered by skill. In the proportion in which they have been so understood and mastered, their preternatural vestments have to some extent been reduced to shreds, preserved among the more ignorant as "survivals," while in other cases they have been inherited and worn by the next series of unmastered obstructions or uncomprehended phenomena. The adaptation of man to his physical environment antedates his social, moral, and religious evolutions; consequently the phantasms that fade from his outer world have a tendency to pass into his inner world, undergoing

such modifications as enable them to describe the pains and perils which beset his progress beyond mere animal needs and aims.

There is as much real reasoning in this *ex cathedra* utterance as in any part of the book; rationalistic hypotheses fitting wonderfully into evolutionist prejudices are elevated into fact because of their appropriateness; all accounts of the origin of evil, whether Indian, Scandinavian, or Hebrew, are myths, the proof that they are myths being the sufficient one that they *can* be translated into mythical form by modern ingenuity. Our author is in this last respect a victim of a mania that is, we hope, already beginning to be laughed at. In this month's *Frazer* (March) there is an article entitled "John Gilpin as a Solar Hero," in which the author assumes as a premiss that every cultured reader knows that all our legends and fables are forms of the solar myth, and he then proceeds to show how "John Gilpin" is only yet another description of what the ancients called "*solis iter*." However learned and however ingenious Mr. Conway's explanations may be, there are few of them that are not properly replied to in the old school form, "*quod gratis asseritur, gratis negatur*." There are two things that deter us from entering any further into a criticism of this long and complex statement of a case—it would only offend Catholic ears to quote any of the passages in which such sacred subjects as our Lord's Incarnation, or His Holy Mother's Immaculate Conception are spoken of, and of course they are necessarily included in a discussion of the Fall. Next, the author either takes for granted that the supernatural does not exist; and then, as we fancy, he ought first to give a sufficient reason for the persistent and similar recourse of all ages and nations to the supernatural; or, if he admits some supernatural element in the history of the world, his method is too wanting in critical appreciation to let us see when he is seriously repeating a story as probable and when ridiculing it: just as in Mark Twain's volumes of travels, we can never draw the hard-and-fast line between description and grotesque fun. Can the author, for example, be serious when he says, "In Russia the pigeon, from being anciently consecrated to the thunder-god, has become the emblem of the Holy Ghost, or Celestial fire," &c.? Is St. John's *ὁς περιστερᾶν*, then, a Russian or other myth? It may be highly scientific (certainly highly soothing) to have reduced the devil to a phantom; but there may be a weakness for myths as childish as the weakness for pre-natural explanations of obstacles to progressive adaptation.

The Intermediate Education History of England. Part I. to A.D. 1485. By EDMOND WREN, M.A. London. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Sons. 1881.

THE main object of this English History is, the author tells us, to supply Irish schools with a manual "free from all passages of offence and misstatement," and at the same time "fully abreast with the knowledge and requirements of the time"—a truly noble object for a Catholic author at the present day. Such a work need not demand original research; the present one professes to be based on the best

authorities, and conspicuous use has been made of Lingard, Freeman, and Stubbs. Two main requirements should be paramount with the writer of such a work; absolute soundness of statement, and next, such an exposition of safe information as will easily live in the memory of the scholar, and help to the formation of a *taste* for history. It is beyond doubt that the needs of "cramming" cannot be consulted, if the latter requirement is to be met. Cramming demands an accumulation of dates, facts, names, tersely worded reflections; in the acquirement of which dry bones little leisure remains for thought of the growing, living form of history proper. Even in the choice of details, a skilful historian will by choosing those that are characteristic, or by grouping together seemingly diverse tendencies, give them unity in the young mind and consequent influence over his further studies. Mr. Wren's book, therefore—highly condensed foreign and domestic, legislative and constitutional history; formulated, dated, amply supplied with tables, chronological and genealogical, and extending in 340 octavo pages only to A.D. 1485—being tested as a "handbook to students preparing for the annual examinations of the Board of Intermediate Education," may be no other than it ought to be, the said examination being surely a cruelty to young minds, and a parody on the qualifying "intermediate." The boy or girl who has mastered this handbook, and passed in it, ought forthwith to be presented with a professorship. Histories used to be read in schools. This one, in many parts, would be nearly as unreadable as a dictionary, from the compression into a page of so much heterogenous matter—the stringing together of desultory events. Let it be added, however, that this character of the book will be considered generally at the present moment a great advantage, and that it has apparently been assumed from conviction of the author that he should meet a demand rather than guide practice into another channel. It is a result of dire necessity therefore that there is little dramatic grouping in Mr. Wren's pages, and that many of those vivid pictures of an event that characterizes a period or person once and for ever to the young reader, are abbreviated to baldness, or omitted to make way for names and figures. In a Catholic history one would have liked to meet St. Gregory and the Saxon slaves, an incident not beneath one of Mr. Green's best descriptive efforts; we miss, too, such striking passages as the old Ealdorman's speech to Eadwine on the Gospel of Paulinus—passages worth (for "education" in remote history) any amount of monotonous lists of names and dates of battles—too often petty fights, mere robber maraudings—or of such details as the table of Egbert's descent from Woden.

These exceptions having been taken, not to Mr. Wren's book, but to the present method of teaching history, we may pass to the other requirement for a textbook for Catholics, soundness of statement. We mean not correctness only, but "sound"-ness—the true ring of both words and expressions. We should have liked this book better if there had been a perceptible Catholicity about its style: less of the complexionless character of Lingard.

Thomæ Vallavrii Inscriptiones. Accedit OSVALDI BERRINII. Appendix de Stilo Inscriptionum. Augustæ Tavrinatorvm; Lavrentivs Romanvs. 1880.

THIS is not a book for the general reader. Even if we restrict the term general to those who have received a liberal education; how few of these will ever feel tempted or constrained to write a Latin inscription? But, again, even if a Latin inscription had to be composed, how few scholars would fancy they needed for the task in addition to their classical knowledge a special treatise "*De stilo inscriptionum*" and a large collection of examples occupying five hundred quarto pages? Would they not be tempted to say, forcibly but not very originally, with erudite Oswald Berrinius, beginning his ninth chapter "*De Scriptura Inscriptionum*," "*Parvis sane de rebus hoc (caput) est?*" It will readily be admitted, however, by classical scholars, that not a few inscriptions are written year by year which have little flavour of Livy or the Appian Way about them, and that consequently concerning these chapters and examples we may add—again with Berrinius—"sed quas nosse non parvi interest." The large number of works on inscriptions—many of them of considerable size, as, *e.g.*, the "*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*"—show how much the subject engages the attention of scholars. There is a certain art in writing an epitaph or "inscription," as truly as there is special poetic art in the construction of a sonnet. There is a choice of names of words and of things; a dignity of style; a subtle combination of brevity and clearness; a significant rhythm and measure of lines; certain forms of abbreviation—in an inscription that is artfully constructed. To teach these is the object of the treatise "*De Stilo*," which forms a solid appendix to this book, of nearly a hundred and fifty pages quarto. To illustrate these by examples of singular grace and art, the publisher has issued this collection—in all, seven hundred and fifty in number—of Thomas Vallaurius. These are arranged under various headings, *Inscriptiones Sacræ, Honorariæ, Funerum Publicorum, &c.* Each class presents features peculiar to itself. Perhaps we shall do best to quote an example (pp. 478, 9) from the last division of this collection, in which a few existing inscriptions "*vitiis deformatæ*" are rewritten according to the requirements of art.

In fronte ædis S. Caroli.

D . CAROLI . TEMPLO
 REX . CAROLVS . ALBERTVS . P . F . A .
 LAPIDEVM . FRONTEM . ADDIDIT
 MARIA . CHRISTINA . BORB . AVGVSTA
 STATVIS . EXORNAVIT
 ORDINE . DECVRIONVM . ET . PIORVM
 OPERIS . ADIVTORE

Thus corrected :

TEMPLVM . CAROLINIANVM
 REX . CAROLVS . ALBERTVS . P . F . A
 LAPIDEO . FRONTE . VESTIVIT

MARIA . CHRISTINA . BORBONIA . AVG .
 STATVIS . EXORNAVIT
 ORDINE . DECVRIONVM . ET . CIVIVM . PIETATE
 SVFFRAGANTIBUS

We cannot too highly commend the treatise of O. Berrinius to all scholars; the amount of information not easily to be found elsewhere here methodically arranged—on such points as modes of spelling proper names, &c.—will be very useful beyond the mere needs of inscription writing.

We must briefly refer to one section of Vallaurius' collection that will have an interest to Catholics quite different from the technical one, and recalling perhaps the Catacomb inscriptions of Pope Damasus. It is headed "*Fasti Rerum Gestarum a Pio IX. Pontifice Maximo ab an. 1846 ad an. 1868,*" and the inscriptions commemorate the most salient events in the life of the great pontiff; forming a pithy but clear outline of his public life. Then follows a section containing nearly one hundred and fifty inscriptions, "*pro incolumitate Pii IX. P. P. Italorum vota,*" from various cities, towns, societies and even individuals: earlier ones wishing for him the years of Peter, later ones rejoicing that he had lived beyond them. Lastly we must notice a third section relating to the same subject: "*Album Italorum Pio IX. Pont. Max. oblatum an. millesimo octingentesimo ex quo Petrus et Paulus Apostoli martyrium Romæ fecerunt,*" and containing more than eighty inscriptions from Rome, Milan, Terracina, Corneto and other Italian cities and towns. We are greatly tempted to quote examples, but must resist. The book is dedicated to the present Holy Father, "*cultori et vindici studiorum optimorum,*" and is elegantly printed and very carefully edited.

The Life of Father John Gerard, of the Society of Jesus. By JOHN MORRIS of the same Society. Third Edition, rewritten and enlarged. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.

THE quick demand for a new edition of such a book as this, is, we take it, a very good sign of the times. The perusal of it can scarcely fail of some distinct measure of good result with both Catholic and other readers. The one will feel fresh love and enthusiasm for their faith at sight of the heroism and sufferings of such men as Father Gerard; the other will, we fancy, esteem less a cause that struggled so pertinaciously, in close imitation of pagan persecution, against the meek and the unoffending, and that has survived to see them in its decay returning to take new root in the land.

Those who already know Father Morris's work in either of the former editions will only need to be told that this one has been written and very much enlarged. Every step of the work, as it proceeds, is supported by contemporary documents or testimony; and it is just this character which gives the book its great charm. Documents surviving—one often marvels how—in State Paper or other offices, and

in Colleges of the Society abroad, have been consulted, and collated with a patience that excites surprise;—everywhere notes of authorities bear evidence to the stability of the text, whilst this latter is frequently interrupted to make way for letters written by the actors in the scene, the quaint old spelling adding to their value. When we add that the autobiography of Father Gerald enters largely into the narrative, it will be easy to believe that this volume is redolent in numerous ways of the period it covers, and revives a most instructive picture of the habits, the home-life, and the feelings of Englishmen during the quarter of a century from 1580 to 1606.

It is not, however a mere collection of documents—far from it. Father Morris has, with great skill and mastery of his materials, woven them into a narrative that is at once clear, interesting and authentic. Notes at the conclusion of some of the chapters go more into details in the elucidation of difficult or obscure points; they may thus, if the reader choose, be passed by, and the narrative pursued in pleasant quietude. We shall not refer to the long-disputed knowledge of the Gunpowder Plot by Fathers Garnet and Gerard further than to say that chapter the thirty-first gives ample evidence as to Father Gerard's own innocence, and that the notes to that chapter, dealing with some assertions of Canon Tierney and Dr. Lingard, ought to be read by all history students of that event.

A word ought in justice to be said of the publishers' part in this excellent book; its outward appearance is elegant—a style of binding that is new to us. Not only are paper and type excellent, but, what is vastly more important, the text is wonderfully free from typographical errors. The clearly printed copies—by the Woodbury process—of old prints; one a chart of the Tower of London; the others views of Louvain and Liège, are very interesting; the one of the Tower especially so. We sincerely wish Father Morris's book, the result doubtless of long and assiduous labour, all the success it deserves.

Erin. Verses, Irish and Catholic. By the Rev. MATTHEW RUSSELL, S.J.
Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son. 1881.

THE many admirers of Father Russell's former volumes, "*Emmanuel*" and "*Madonna*," will not be disappointed with this one, although the pieces of which it is composed are short and less pretentious. The character of the verses is very varied, but, as a rule, rather secular than sacred, and this fact is accounted for (no "excuse" is needed) by their having been written, in great part, before the author was a priest. Most of the poems, too, are Irish in subject, and are characterized by illustration and incident drawn from Irish life at home—this gives them a charm that we are sure numerous children of Ireland in distant countries will appreciate. We can find space for only one short quotation (p. 11); a stanza from the pleasant descriptive piece: "*The Irish Farmer's Sunday Morning*." The family have just sat down to Sunday's breakfast:

Before the sire an egg, one only, lies,
 Laid by as good a duck as ever swam ;*
 Whereof the top, removed 'neath wistful eyes,
 Regales his little pet, his youngest lamb—
 Her with the flaxen curls and eyes so calm.
 Before the sire the loaf-bread† too, is laid
 To be dispensed in slices thin, like ham :
 For it, alas ! the hard-earned pence were paid ;
 The gulf still left is filled with coarser sort, home-made.

A little prose poem, "The Sleepy Carthusian," appears at the end of the volume, and would be, even if alone, worth the purchase of the book. It has already appeared in the pages of the *Irish Monthly*, and is a very happy translation from the French : those who duly appreciate the lesson shining through the quaint story, will, with the *Spectator*, pronounce the piece "a veritable gem."

Les Registres d'Innocent IV., Recueil des Bulles de ce Pape. Publiées ou analysées d'après les Manuscrits Originaux du Vatican et de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris. Par ELIE BERGER. Paris : E. Thorin.

M. THORIN, the enterprising publisher to whom we are indebted for so many useful works, has just undertaken to bring out a complete edition of the Bulls issued by Pope Innocent IV. The collection, when it is completed, will be of the most valuable character as a source of information on the history of the Middle Ages. Created Pope on the 24th of June, 1243, after the death of Celestine IV., who had occupied the Holy See for a space of only sixteen days, Innocent IV. may be regarded almost as the successor of Gregory IX., whose policy he continued in his relations with the Empire. He reigned during eleven years and a half, and the acts of his administration are of so important a nature that they fully deserved a separate and carefully annotated publication. The *ensemble* of the Papal Bulls connected with Innocent IV. amounts to about eight thousand six hundred ; the first five years of the original *regesta*, the eighth, and all the following ones are preserved in the Vatican archives ; the sixth forms part of the treasures belonging to the Paris National Library ; the seventh is lost. M. Berger, already known by several scholarly publications, is the editor of the work we are announcing here ; and although the preface is not to be issued till the last fasciculus of the first volume, we can form, to a certain extent, a tolerably correct idea of the nature and plan of the publication from the introductory part now before us. Each Bull is preceded by a short *résumé*, and represented by one or more quotations of various lengths, according to the character and importance of the document ; sometimes the entire Bull is given.

* Ducks' eggs commend themselves more to the rustic palate than eggs of a milder flavour.

† As contra-distinguished from griddle-bread.

Between the years 1243 and 1254, several Bulls were not registered; these are omitted by M. Berger, who has merely reprinted the documents forming part of the *regesta*. The pieces which have been already included in Potthast's well-known collection are analysed from that work, and the present editor has consulted the disquisition or memoir published some time ago by M. Hauréau in the "Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits," tome xxiv. part 2, under the following title: *Quelques Lettres d'Innocent IV.: Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. It is well known also that La Torte du Keis had caused copies to be made of certain of the original Bulls; these copies are at the Bibliothèque Nationale (*fonds Moreau*), and have been collated by M. Berger; they are comprised in the following volumes: No. 1194 (1st and 2nd years of the Pontificate); No. 1195 (3rd year); No. 1196 (6th year); No. 1197 (5th year); No. 1198-1200 (6th year); No. 1201 (8th and 9th years); No. 1202 (10th year); No. 1203 (11th and 12th years).

The best way, perhaps, of giving to our readers an idea of M. Berger's work will be to transcribe one of the entries, and for that purpose we have selected a short document printed on page 68:—

384 au Latran, 4 Décembre, 1243.

Causam Dominici, Ulixbonensis canonici, quem Burgensis episcopus, tunc Oxoniensis episcopus, ab Ecclesia de Marvilla amoverat, et postea excommunicaverat, infrascriptis committit (Reg. an. 1, No. 382, fol. 64 verso.)

"Petro Gondisalvi archidiacono, . . . cantori et magistro Bartt [olomeo] canonico, Colimbricensibus Constitutus in presentia—Dat. Laterani, ii. Nonas Decembris, anno primo.

Exposuit Dominicus, canonicus Ulixbonensis, quod Burgensis tunc Oxoniensis Episcopus, receptis a Gregorio IX. literis in, quibus mandabatur ei ut ipsum et quosdam alios a rege Portugalie beneficiis ornatos spoliaret, ipsum sine iudicio nec ostensis papæ litteris ab ecclesia de Marvilla amovisse, de qua quidem Dominicus se vreoem appellationis ad Sedem Apostolicam emisisse contendit; episcopus vero appellatione sprete executionis sententiam promulgavit. Dominico ad ultimum excommunicato et jubente Innocentio per Reinardum poenitentiarium pontificium a prædicta sententia ad cautelam jam antea absoluto, mandat superscriptis papa ut processus contra eum intentos, si corvenerit, irritos denuntient, si autem bene judicatum fuerit, confirment.

In the original *regesta* the names of certain persons are almost universally omitted, and two dots inserted instead, thus: ". . . Archiepiscopo Terraconensi," ". . . abbati sancti Johannis Parmensis," etc. The index, which is to complete the work, will give, as much as possible, the names thus left out purposely by the *Registratores*. M. Berger has enjoyed the great advantage, during a residence of four years at Rome, of the assistance and encouragement of several eminent *savants* connected with the Vatican library and the archives; he thanks especially in his introductory note the Cardinals Pitra and Hergenröther, Professor Balan and Monsignor Ciccolini. The fasciculus we have thus been noticing, printed on fine paper and in bold type, in two columns quarto, gives us sheets 1-16 of the first volume, and includes Bulls 1-747; the first document is dated Anayni, July 2, 1243; the last, Cività Castellana, June 21, 1244.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire de Paris, avec le Journal de ses Actes. Vol. III. Paris : Hachette.

IN our last number we reviewed briefly the first two volumes of M. Wallon's "*Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire*," promising to return to it as soon as the next instalment was published; we have now to notice the third volume, and to draw the attention of our readers once more to the horrors of *sans-culottism* let loose upon society. Two months only, Germinal and Floréal, of the year II., have sufficed to supply the contents of a thick octavo, but at that epoch both the tribunals and the guillotine were hard at work, and the trial of the obscurest individual, however quietly it was despatched, necessitated a number of questions, reports, evidence and documents of various kinds which represented an enormous amount of paper. In M. Wallon's third volume the trials refer to incriminated persons belonging to every class of society, clerks, soldiers, clergymen—both *assermentés* and *insermentés*—noblemen, ladies, &c. ; Lavoisier and the farmers-general of the taxes; Malesherbes; the victims of Verdun, whom Victor Hugo immortalized in one of his most beautiful odes, at a time when he had not joined the clique of Messrs. Paul Bert, Spuller, Gambetta & Co.; last, but not least, Madame Elisabeth, the sainted sister of Louis XVI. Whilst examining these melancholy remains of an epoch of madness, one thing strikes us very forcibly—namely, the attitude and the fate of the wretched creatures who, forswearing their principles, in order to save their lives, and endeavouring to prove the genuineness of their new-fledged republicanism by exaggerated zeal, found that cowardice was generally a brand of reprobation, even at the bar of the committee of public safety, and that neither Fouquier-Tinville, nor Saint-Just, set any value on the support of men who had lost all feeling of decency and honour.

The trial and death of Madame Elisabeth belong to the period in the Reign of Terror when Robespierre had got rid, as he supposed, of all his rivals, and was exercising unlimited power throughout France; the festival of the *Supreme Being* had just been decreed, the existence of God and the immortality of the soul were proclaimed as the faith of regenerated France, and with his hands still reddened by the blood of the Girondists and the Hébertists, Barnave, Danton and Camille Desmoulins, the new dictator was setting fire to the "hydra of atheism." Many people, as M. Wallon remarks, might have supposed, and probably did suppose, that the time had come at last for closing the era of terrorism, and stopping the monotonous work of the guillotine; the preamble to the decree of Floreal proved, alas! that more blood was about to be shed, and that Robespierre did not yet feel quite secure in the enjoyment of his power. The existence of Madame Elisabeth was an insult to the Republic, under the *régime* then prevailing; it was the easiest thing in the world to find against any person already condemned beforehand, charges, witnesses, proofs of guilt. Chauvrau-Lagarde, who had been appointed counsel for the princess, had barely time allowed him to collect his thoughts, and to settle the succession of his arguments; he knew that the task

entrusted to him was hopeless, but he did his duty and did it nobly, regardless of the frightful consequences it necessarily entailed. The episode which M. Wallon has chiefly dwelt upon in his volume is the trial of Danton and his co-accused; it is undoubtedly one of the most interesting in the whole history of the Revolution, because it marks the beginning of a reaction towards more moderate views, reaction which Danton and Camille Desmoulins especially would have brought to a successful issue, had they displayed greater energy in their opposition to Robespierre. Public opinion was expressing itself with considerable frankness as to the real character of the ultra-radicals: Marat's reputation had lost much in the imagination of the people; the groups of citizens in the boulevards, and the other places of resort, discussed freely the probable destiny of Santerre, Henriot, Chaumette, and the other acolytes of Robespierre and Saint-Just; immediate action became indispensable, the *enragés*, as they were called, did not lose a minute, and the result was the adjournment till the 9th Thermidor of the downfall of Jacobinism. M. Wallon has now to relate to us the last acts of the revolutionary tribunal, and we have no doubt that his concluding volume will more than realize the promise given in those we have already reviewed.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

Études Sociales et Économiques. Par AUGUSTIN COCHIN, précédées d'une Notice par M. le Duc de BROGLIE, de l'Académie Française. 8vo. Paris: Didier.

LIKE Frédéric Ozanam and Count de Melun, M. Augustin Cochin belonged to the band of noble thinkers who saw in Christianity alone the means of rescuing society, and French society more especially, from the destruction which threatened it, and who opposed to the arrogant pretensions of modern radicalism the wholesome doctrines of the Word of God. He occupied several important posts during the Second Empire, and rendered signal services to his country after the disaster of Sedan and the downfall of Napoleon III.; the touching and eloquent letter addressed by him to M. Thiers is one of the most interesting *pièces justificatives* in the biographical memoir for which we are indebted to Count de Falloux.

M. Cochin had written much, not from any desire of obtaining literary distinction, but because as president or secretary of industrial and charitable societies, he found himself obliged to draw up reports, compose lectures, and avail himself generally of the press to vulgarize sound notions on political economy and other kindred subjects. These various pamphlets and brochures will, we are glad to see, be collected and reprinted, the first volume being the one we are now noticing, introduced by an excellent notice, the author of which, the Duc de Broglie, was one of M. Cochin's most intimate friends, and his colleague and collaborateur in many associations. To a large proportion of our readers the very name of this gentleman may not be even known; we shall therefore venture, without any apology, to translate a portion of the Duc de Broglie's preface, for it is useful to see how, in the most difficult times, God raises witnesses for himself, and men who make

it the business of their lives to direct society into the only path which leads to real happiness.

... He was a consummate master of the art of bringing near one another in sympathetic communion an orator and hearers who are separated by their habits of life and their early education. No one, I believe, has ever equalled him on that ground. Familiar without being trivial, always raising the thoughts of his audience without soaring above their intellectual capacity, knowing how to move them, and yet never appealing to any unwholesome passion, he dismissed them proud of having enjoyed the noblest of pleasures, never regretting the modesty of their social condition.

But it was necessary for him to throw a great deal of variety into his address, whilst discussing the same ideas and treating the same principles: on one occasion, the theatre of these short and urgent allocutions was one of those societies of Christian apprentices or workmen, abodes of quiet where young men, inspired by a courageous faith, came to seek fresh strength for the purpose of resisting the more efficaciously against corrupt surroundings; the next day, at a railway terminus, or a workshop, he had to speak to one of those motley crowds gathered together by the nature of their toil, and who only put in common their material wants. To the former class, to the young Christians who constituted his chosen family, M. Cochin used to say that it is not enough to feel honoured by the name of Christian; believers should grace their profession, not merely by being better than others, but by showing themselves more skilful. The best way, he used to say, of putting to silence the taunts of false or half-science, was to be in their lives more eager to realize the progress which science has introduced even in the sphere of manual arts. With the others he followed a different course; by showing to them a warm and intelligent sympathy, by sharing their ambition, and above all their legitimate affections, he tried to make them appreciate the holy principle which animated him, and to show to them the amount of charm, of purity, and peace, which religion would bring to their fireside. Thus, by a discrimination no one would have expected, he spoke more especially to some of the necessity of intellectual development, whilst with the others he appealed chiefly to the heart. But if the means differed, the result was always the same: to make of good Christians the best workmen, and to transform into Christians all good workmen.

Such being the character of M. Cochin, we may easily imagine what a loss French society suffered, when, in 1872, it pleased God to take him to Himself. The essays collected in this volume are five in number: they treat respectively of, 1st, The Condition of French Workmen; 2nd, Social Reform in France; 3rd, Co-operative Societies; 4th, Provident Institutions; 5, The History of the Looking-Glass Manufacture of Saint Gobain from its Origin (1665) to the Year 1865. An appendix of illustrative notes terminates the work.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

Étude sur le Traité du Libre Arbitre de Vauvenargues. Par L'Abbé M. MORLAIS.. Paris: Thorin.

VAUVENARGUES has obtained as a moralist, and especially as a writer, a celebrity which is universally acknowledged, even by those who are the least disposed to endorse his opinions; and in the list, which includes the names of Montaigne, Pascal, La Bruyère and La

Rochefoucauld, he holds a place so much the more eminent because he stands alone in his views of human nature; and, by a strange combination of Jansenist notions with the philanthropy so fashionable during the last century, he endeavours to rehabilitate us in our own opinion. Montaigne was a sceptic; the great Port Royal thinker, the hero of the Fronde, and the author of the "Caractères," are strong pessimists, each one, it is true, from a different point of view; Vauvenargues, on the contrary, places himself at the standpoint of optimism, and his great aim is to find a motive for our actions, a golden rule, if we may so say, without being obliged to have recourse to Christianity. The most extraordinary thing, however, is that, after all, his doctrine is a kind of fatalism tempered by important concessions made to the naturalist views and *humanitarian* (we beg pardon for this word) aspirations of his contemporaries. Man, he says to his opponents, is born in sin; he is incapable of knowing the truth and of doing good; he is a fallen creature, deserving nothing but maledictions. Why then crush him under this terrible weight? Why make his weakness a cause of accusation? Why call him to account for crimes of which he is not responsible? He is a mere instrument in the hands of God, true; but this very fact is his title of glory. Far, then, from cursing him we should encourage him, and admire the great things which God accomplishes by him. God, we are often told, abandons to evil those whom He has not predestinated, and condemns those whom He does not draw to Himself; but His justice is not ours, He is an incomprehensible God, *Deus absconditus*. It has pleased Him to enlighten some and to blind others. This last clause, we see, is as thoroughly fatalist as the most express declarations of Saint Cyran and Singlin, but Vauvenargues finds in it a motive, not of depreciating man, but rather of exalting him, because he looks upon him as commissioned by the Almighty to carry out His will and realize His purposes.

If we study carefully the writings of Vauvenargues, we find in him a strong resemblance, on the one hand with Pascal, and on the other with Descartes; this circumstance has been very well brought out by M. l'Abbé Morlais. Like Pascal, he is chiefly anxious about moral and religious truth; like him he deems scientific acquirements and mere erudition as very worthless compared with the knowledge of man and of man's destiny. "We apply ourselves," he says, "to the study of chemistry, of astronomy, to erudition, as if the sciences were the most important. O blind madness! Is glory a name? Is virtue an error? Is faith a mere phantom? What do I want to know? What does it behove me to be acquainted with? ("Discours Préliminaire," 1st partie.) The point of similarity which we find between Vauvenargues and Descartes is an intense longing for certainty, an irresistible anxiety to throw off the bondage of scepticism and to find a safe substratum for the elements of our knowledge. He would fain eliminate Christianity, but he cannot do so, and although he never expressed himself on the truth of revealed religion with the decision and the explicit frankness of a believer, still he managed to bring down upon his devoted head the wrath of Voltaire, who would not admit that

Christianity and *philosophy* had anything in common. "Ne peut on pas admirer l'Etre suprême," exclaimed the Ferney deist, "sans être capiscin?"

M. l'Abbé Morlais has, we think, done excellent work by the publication of his essay; it is divided into two parts. The author begins by a short account of Vauvenargues, considered as a moralist, showing what was the original side of his character, and how far he yielded to the influence both of the writers of the seventeenth century, and of his own contemporaries; a complete analysis of the "*Traité du libre arbitre*" terminates this portion of the work. The second is devoted to a discussion of principles; it deals with the question of determinism examined in all its bearings, and concludes by asserting the principle of the freedom of the will against the predestinarian errors of certain theologians on the one side, and the sophistries, on the other, of modern scientists who would reduce man to the degrading position of a mere machine, irresponsible, destitute therefore of merit, and no more accountable for his acts than a stone or a cunningly devised piece of machinery.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

Cloister Songs and Hymns for Children. By Sister MARY FRANCES CLARE. London: Burns & Oates. Dublin: Gill & Son. 1881.

THIS volume of songs, hymns, and translations is from the active pen of the "Nun of Kenmare," and will find a ready welcome wherever her numerous works are known and admired. Although the pieces are over eighty in number and on a great variety of themes, there is a distinct bond of union in the religious tone pervading them, and in the object they share in common, of exciting or fostering sentiments of piety. Some of the hymns have already been indulged—one to S. Brendan by the Bishop of Kerry, and two others, to SS. Patrick and Brigid, by the Archbishop of Westminster. The hymn portion of the book, therefore, scarcely comes within the province of criticism. Let it suffice that, although all the pieces are not of equal merit—although in a few of them an impassioned reading might reveal piety rather than poetry—yet on the whole they are both poetical and good. Some of the small faults that might be found of construction, metre, &c., would, it can scarcely be doubted, have been found by the talented authoress herself if she had cared for the *labor limæ*. Or, perhaps, she feared to mar by artful processes the effect of spontaneous effusions that she intended should speak to, as they sprang from, the heart. Of the lighter songs, if that may be said, the best is, "The Bell-Tower;" but it is too long for quotation. "The Bells of Kenmare," suits better our limited space.

THE BELLS OF KENMARE.

I.

The bells in the steeple
Are calling the people.
Are calling the people to prayer.

From the mountains rebounding,
The echo resounding
Fills all the sweet vale of Kenmare.

II.

Up where the heather
And furze grow together,
Where the gold-crested wren and the plover are found,
The shepherd boy listens,
While his bright grey eye glistens,
As their melody falleth and ringeth around.

III.

And the old men, amazed,
Say the great God be praised,
Who maketh such music resound through the air;
And the women, upraising
Their hands, are all praising
The good priest who gave them the Bells of Kenmare.

IV.

Now clanging and clashing.
Now thundering and dashing,
And waking the echoes for miles far away;
Now stealing and pealing,
'Their sweet notes revealing,
Like the murmur of song, heard by sunset's last ray.

V.

Far out on the ocean,
With tremulous motion,
Their jubilant clamour they bear.
From the topmast, the sailor
Shouts Home is near, hail her,
For I hear the sweet Bells of Kenmare.

VI.

So glad is the gladness,
So sad is the sadness
Of these musical bells as they swing through the air,
You know not if weeping
Or joy is in keeping
With the music that rings from the Bells of Kenmare.

The Prophecies of Isaiah: a New Translation, with Commentary and Appendices. By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford, and Member of the Old Testament Revision Company. Vol. II. London: C. Kegan, Paul & Co. 1881.

WE have already expressed a very strong opinion on the high merits of this commentary in reviewing the first volume. The second and concluding volume is in every way worthy of that

which preceded it. It carries to the end an exposition marked by the same fulness of learning; learning which is never ostentatiously displayed, but is always subservient to the illustration of the text. But, besides this, the second volume contains essays of extreme interest on Messianic prophecy in general, and the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah in particular. They will well repay the study of the theologian, for they are theological, and not merely critical and philological; though, of course, Biblical theology, if it deserves the name, must be founded on a careful study of the text in its grammatical and historical sense. It is about this part of Mr. Cheyne's book that we now desire to speak.

We are convinced that he has given very valuable help to the student of Christian evidences, and, as Catholics, we feel bound to welcome such good work done in so Christian a spirit. On many other subjects treated of we should like to say something; and on a few of these we shall touch briefly. But we are writing a notice, not an article, and we must make a selection.

The Christian argument from prophecy is most certainly one of the "things that cannot be shaken," but, like other arguments, it needs, and it will repay, careful study. We have long thought that when a student has made himself familiar with the text of the Hebrew Bible he should begin with the minute investigation of the prophetic writings, and that for the following reason. The study of the historical books is encumbered with numberless questions as to date and authenticity; we cannot, of course, assume the traditional theory as to their origin in controversy with many of those who differ from us, and complicated theories must be mastered and examined before even the present position of the question can be understood. With the prophets it is otherwise. Here, too, controversy as to date and authenticity does exist, and very important questions are raised, *e.g.*, on the unity of the books ascribed to Isaias, Micheas, and Zacharias, or on the date at which Joel's prophecy was written. Still, the ground occupied by controversy of this sort is comparatively narrow, and the questions raised, momentous as they are, are not nearly so momentous as those on, *e.g.*, the origin of the Levitical legislation. It is easier, then, with regard to the prophets, to be sure that we are reasoning from admitted premises, and to secure sure footing for subsequent historical enquiry. Still, putting aside all questions of date and authorship; putting aside even the grammatical difficulties, which in the early prophets are often very serious, much toil must be undergone before we can really understand the "Christian element" in the prophets. Different aspects of revelation are seized by different prophets; the revelation itself was developed in many portions; and from many sides. There is a development of doctrine in the Old Testament, and nothing can be more unscientific than to look on prophetic writings as one book, because the same Spirit spoke in all the writers. Moreover, it may well happen that when we have been accustomed from childhood to the prophecies of Christ, we feel as if the words had lost their edge when we come to study them for the first time in their context and connection. We find the words which

we used to refer to Christ, scarcely imagining that they admitted of another reference, embedded in a context which seems to contradict the Messianic interpretation. Look, for example, at some of the Psalms expressly referred to Christ in the New Testament. In Psalm lxi. we have the prophecy of the reproaches which fell on Christ, the vinegar given Him for His thirst, the "familiar friend" who turned against Him. But, on the other hand, verse vi. runs, "Thou knowest my folly, and my transgressions are not hid from Thee," and the imprecations in the latter part of the Psalm seem to jar with the Messianic interpretation. So, again, in Psalm xli., we have, on the one hand, the striking words applied to our Lord Himself, in John xiii. 18, to the treachery of Judas: "The man with whom I was at peace, in whom I trusted, who eat My bread, hath lifted up his heel against Me;" and, on the other hand, the sufferer depicted in the Psalm confesses his own sin ("heal my soul for I have sinned against Thee,") and asks God's help to "repay" his enemies. In Psalm lxxii. we have the promise of a king who is to be feared and honoured while sun and moon endure; but still, although this description will not suit a mere mortal, it might be argued that many other details—such as the prayer which is to be continually made for him, his rule from "sea to sea," &c., fit in better with an idealized description of the Jewish monarchy than with the spiritual reign of Christ. Just the same difficulties meet us in the writings of the prophets. Thus, in Isaiah, the child to be born of the Virgin (apart from all difficulties as to the translation of the most important word) seems to be promised, not for the distant future, but for the exigencies of the time in which the prophet lived. The "servant of the Lord," so prominent in the later chapters, and who answers so wonderfully to the picture which the Gospels give of the teaching and suffering Christ, is yet undoubtedly identified with the people in xlii. 19, xliii. 10; while in xli. 8, 9, xlv. 1, 2, 21, xlv. 4, and xlviii. 20, it is "the kernel of the nation, the spiritual Israel."

A deeper study removes those difficulties, confirms belief in the argument from prophecy, and, more than this, convinces us that there is a fuller and deeper meaning than we had imagined before in the ancient saying, "The New Testament is latent in the Old." We find that the whole history of Israel is regarded by the prophets as a preparation for the Messianic blessings of the future. Because the Messiah was to spring from the seed of Abraham, because he was to spring from the tribe of Juda, therefore it was impossible to separate altogether the ideas of salvation through Christ from salvation through Israel and through the royal line of Juda; nor need we wonder if the prophets sometimes do not separate the ideas at all. There is an organic connection, as Hupfield puts it (though the theory so put is not adopted by him) between type and anti-type; and the history of Israel has been compared to a pyramid which culminates in Christ. We have (1) the general promise that Israel is to be the salvation and the light of nations; (2) this promise is limited to a chosen and spiritual seed, to the Israel according to the spirit, which Israel

is the servant of the Lord, and is often personified as a suffering individual; (3) the conception of the spiritual and suffering Israel especially, in Psalm xxii. and Isaiah liii., narrowed still further, and a single person is pointed out. His deliverance is a cause of more than national blessings (see the latter part of Psalm xxii.); his soul is offered as a trespass-offering (see Isaiah liii.); and in minute details the history of his sufferings corresponds to the Passion of Christ. Following out another (we may say the other) line of prophecy, we find promises made to David and his seed, and a universal dominion promised to them (as in Psalm ii.); one future king is pointed out, and (as in Psalm lxxii.) superhuman attributes are ascribed to him, while in Isaiah he is distinctly said to be "the mighty God." In that familiar Psalm—so familiar to us from its constant recurrence in the Vesper Office—"Dixit Dominus Domino meo," the two lines of prophecy meet together, and the Messias is portrayed at once in his regal and in his priestly dignity.*

We may notice three points in which Isaiah illustrates the supernatural character of, and rises to the sublimest height of, Hebrew prophecy.

More clearly than any other writer in the Old Testament he limits the promise to the spiritual Israel. Abraham is the source of blessing, but it is the few genuine believers who are Abraham's representatives. "There is no peace to the wicked." "A redeemer shall come to Sion, and to those that have turned from rebellion in Jacob: it is the utterance of the Lord" (lix. 20). This is well brought out by Mr. Cheyne, and shews how thoroughly the exegesis of St. Paul in its central point is justified by a careful reading of Isaiah. It would be interesting, if space allowed, to compare the doctrine of election (so Ewald, if we remember right, ventures to call it), as it appears in Joel.

Next, as to the divinity of the Messias, we have the remarkable prophecies, ch. viii.—x. The maiden whom the prophet sees is already with child, and the infant is to be called Immanuel, "God with us." When the announcement of the mysterious birth takes place, the first streak of light is seen in the heavens. The kings of Damascus and Israel are leagued against Judah, but before the infant who is to be born comes to the age when an ordinary child knows the difference between good and evil, the power of these kings will be broken, and Ahaz will see that he had no cause to fear them. But worse evils are in store. The Assyrians are to replace the Israelites and the Syrians. "The stretching of his wings (*i.e.*, the Assyrian host), will fill thy land, O Immanuel" (viii. 6). Immanuel Himself is to share in the troubles of His people. His food is to be "milk and honey," *i.e.*, as is plain from the end of chapter vii., He

* Observe that, even if we assume the existence of Maccabean Psalms, Ps. cx. cannot apply to a Maccabean prince. Their proper dignity was a priestly one—and so Jonathan took the title of high-priest, and acted as king. But the hero of Ps. cx. is first a king, then a priest. The priesthood is attributed to a king, not *vice versâ*. Besides, the Maccabees were in no sense princes "after the order of Melchisedeck."

will feed on such fare because Assyrian devastation has put an end to agriculture.* But the Assyrian might can avail nothing against the design of God. The counsels of the people shall be broken, for "God is with us" (viii. 10). Then the prophet connects the coming deliverance with Galilee of the Gentiles, the very district which had fallen into the rapacious hands of the Assyrian king, Tiglath Pileser, and the prophet breaks into the rapturous strain of prophecy: "A Child is born to us, a Son is given to us, and the government is on His shoulder, and His name is called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace."

This is a fair account; at least we have done our best to conceal and to exaggerate nothing. Surely, no unprejudiced reader can fail to see the marvellous nature of the prophecy, and its more marvellous fulfilment in Christ. His mysterious birth, His perpetual care for His people, the peaceful character of His dominion, His Divinity, are clearly set forth. Moreover, apart from the exegetical authority of the New Testament, the connecting of the Messias with Galilee, and Christ's actual life there, furnish, to say the least, an extraordinary coincidence; and Mr. Cheyne points out the interesting fact that the Jews, in consequence of this prediction, expected the Messias to appear there. Difficulties there certainly are. The child's birth seems to synchronize with the overthrow of Syria, His youth with the Assyrian invasion, and His manhood with the triumph of God's people. We should think it perfectly reasonable, supposing these difficulties to be insuperable, for a man to say: "I cannot resist the strong grounds for acknowledging a true prediction here, and I accept the fact in spite of minor difficulties." But we believe that the difficulties can be explained. The prophet sees the mother, who is already with child, but he sees her in vision. Nowhere does he fix the historical epoch at which the child is to reach the ordinary age of reason. Only *before* that date, he tells Achaz, "The land shall be forsaken, the land at the two kings of which thou art horribly afraid." True, it is Immanuel's land which is to be overshadowed by the Assyrian. But then, in the counsel which God revealed to His servant the prophet, Israel existed chiefly as a preparation for Immanuel; and just because Immanuel was to be born of Judah, all the devices of the nations against the latter were to be shattered and broken. True, Immanuel was to share in the oppression of His people (for we may fairly take the "milk and honey," the only food to be obtained when vineyards and cornfields were wasted, as a poetical description of humiliation under the hands of a foreign foe). But our Lord did, in a special degree, experience deprivation of regal splendour, and actual injustice from foreign enemies; and the Assyrian invasion was the beginning and the type of all subsequent oppression. We advance this interpretation with some diffidence.

* We are convinced that "milk and honey" here can have no other meaning, and we will only ask the reader averse to this interpretation carefully to examine the context.

No doubt the words of Isaiah would naturally convey a different impression as to the date of the Messianic deliverance when addressed to his contemporaries. But they would understand the deliverance itself very imperfectly : and there is nothing extravagant in supposing that the full light of Christian revelation, which has enabled us to understand the substance, also clears up the details of the prophecy.

On the third point, the suffering Messias, we must not linger long. Mr. Cheyne traces with admirable precision the way in which, in various parts of the Old Testament, notably in the Book of Job, the Jewish mind was habituated to the idea of an innocent sufferer ; how the sufferings of the just were connected, in Psalm xxii., with general deliverance ; and how, lastly, in Isaiah liii., the riddle is solved, since the servant of the Lord is afflicted for our peace, and actually lays down His soul as a "trespass-offering." There can be no reasonable doubt that it is an individual sufferer who is before the prophet's mind ; so much so that Ewald is driven to the theory that chapter liii. is a fragment incorporated in his work by the author of Isaiah xl.-lxvi., describing a martyr who died, in the persecution of Manasses. But where in the Old Testament theology can we find any trace of the belief that a martyr could (1) offer his soul in sacrifice, (2) justify many, (3) live after death, and see the work of the Lord prosper in his hands ?

We will only call the reader's attention to excellent notes on the personality of the Holy Ghost, and on the Fatherhood of God, in Isaiah, and proceed to make a brief suggestion on a matter connected with the question on the unity of authorship. The new "covenant," Mr. Cheyne says, is mentioned seven times in Isaiah xi.—nowhere in the rest of the book, as in Amos and Hosea. "The idea of the original covenant, broken by Israel, and renewed by Jehovah, is specially characteristic of Jeremiah. . . . The occurrence of the phrase in Isaiah xl.-lxvi., is certainly difficult to explain on the assumption that Isaiah was the author of these chapters." It may, perhaps, be worth while to remember, on the other side (1) that the "eternal covenant" is a phrase of frequent occurrence in the Pentateuch, where it is used, *e.g.*, in Genesis ix. 10—one of the so-called Elohistic portions of the covenant with Noe ; it is also used of the Sabbath in Exodus xxxi. 16. In Isaiah xxiv. 5, when the writer transports himself in spirit to the time of the exile, the phrase is used probably as in Genesis ix. 16. (2) In Isaiah xl.-lxvi., the "perpetual covenant" is employed (lv. 3, lxi. 8), to indicate a Messianic covenant really perpetual. This covenant was also really new ; but in the latter Isaiah it is never so called. (3) In Jeremiah (xxxi. 31) this covenant is expressly called "new," and the marks which distinguish it from the old are fully stated. It is at least conceivable that this was the course in which the idea and the terminology were developed.

In conclusion, we have only to thank Mr. Cheyne for the kind way in which, at the beginning of this, he speaks of our criticism on his former volume.

W. E. ADDIS.

Hindū Philosophy: The Sāṅkhya Kārikā of Is Wara Krishna; an Exposition of the System of Kapila. By JOHN DAVIES, M.A. (Cantab.)

Hindu Poetry. Containing a new edition of "the Indian Song of Songs," from the Sanskrit of the Gīta Govinda of Jayade Va. Two books from "the Iliad of India" (Mahābhārata). "Proverbial Wisdom," from the Shlokas of the "Hitopadēsa," and other Oriental Poems. By EDWIN ARNOLD, M.A.

Eastern Proverbs and Emblems illustrating old Truths. By the Rev. J. LONG, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, F.R.S. London: Trübner. 1881.

WE have received from Messrs. Trübner these three new volumes of their Oriental Series. The first is the most important of them, and is of the utmost value to students of Hindu metaphysics. It is a translation, carefully executed, and illustrated by very learned and thoughtful annotations of Iswara Krishna's exposition of Kapila's system, regarding which we may here present the following extract from Mr. Davies's Preface.

The system of Kapila may be said to have only an historical value; but on this account alone it is interesting as a chapter in the history of the human mind. It is the earliest attempt on record to give an answer, from reason alone, to the mysterious questions which arise in every thoughtful mind about the origin of the world, the nature and relations of man, and his future destiny. It is interesting, also, and instructive to note how often the human mind moves in a circle. The latest German philosophy, the system of Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann, is mainly a reproduction of the philosophic system of Kapila in its materialistic part, presented in a more elaborate form, but on the same fundamental lines. In this respect the human intellect has gone over the same ground that it occupied more than two thousand years ago; but on a more important question it has taken a step in retreat. Kapila recognized fully the existence of a soul in man, forming, indeed, his proper nature—the absolute Ego of Fichte—distinct from matter and immortal; but our latest philosophy, both here and in Germany, can see in man only a highly developed physical organization. "All external things," says Kapila, "were formed that the soul might know itself and be free." "The study of psychology is vain," says Schopenhauer, "for there is no Psyche."

Mr. Arnold's beautiful translation of the "Indian Song of Songs," is so well known to, and so highly appreciated by, all who are interested in Indian literature, that we need no more here than express our satisfaction at its reappearance in its present form. The two books from the "Iliad of India," now for the first time translated, by which it is accompanied, will doubtless experience, as they deserve, a like favourable reception.

Mr. Long's collection of "Eastern Proverbs and Emblems," though evidently well intentioned, and the fruit of much learning, must be pronounced to be a dull book upon an interesting subject.

The Autobiography of Mark Rutherford, Dissenting Minister. Edited by his friend, REUBEN SHAPCOTT. London: Trübner. 1881.

THIS is a melancholy book; all the more melancholy for the power both of literary expression and of human feeling with which it is

written. We do not know how far the story it tells is real. It is by way of being the autobiography of a man who is educated (the word is hardly applicable, but it may pass) for the ministry of some dissenting sect, and who, as his intellectual horizon widens, gradually loses, one by one, those incoherent beliefs in which he had grown up, and, finding nothing better to replace them—the Catholic Church, with her large and scientific theology, and the marvellous adaptation of her worship to the needs of the human heart, he seems not even to have heard of—passes into the blackness and desolation of utter scepticism. The following passage may serve as a specimen of the volume :

Nakeder and nakeder had I become with the passage of every year, and I trembled to anticipate the complete emptiness to which, beforelong, I should be reduced. What the dogma of immortality was to me I have already described, and with regard to God I was no better. God was obviously not a person in the clouds, and what more was really firm under my feet than this—that the universe was governed by immutable laws ? These laws were not what is commonly understood as God, nor could I discern any ultimate tendency in them. Everything was full of contradiction ; on the one hand was infinite misery ; on the other there were exquisite adaptations producing the highest pleasure ; on the one hand the mystery of a life-long disease, and on the other the equal mystery of the unspeakable glory of the sunrise on a summer's morning over a quiet summer sea. I happened to hear once an atheist discoursing on the follies of theism. If he had made the world he would have made it much better. He would not have racked innocent souls with years of torture, that tyrants might live in splendour. He would not have permitted the earthquake to swallow up thousands of harmless mortals, and so forth. But, putting aside all dependence upon the theory of a coming rectification of such wrongs as these, the atheist's argument was shallow enough. It would have been easy to show that a world such as he imagines is unthinkable, directly we are serious with our conception of it. On whatever lines the world may be framed, there must be *distinction, difference* ; a higher and a lower ; and the lower, relatively to the higher, must always be an evil. The *scale* upon which the higher and lower both are makes no difference. The supremest bliss would not be bliss if it were not *definable* bliss, that is to say, in the sense that it has limits marking it out from something else not so supreme. Perfectly uninterrupted infinite light, without shadow, is a physical absurdity ; I see a thing because it is lighted, but also because of the differences of light, or, in other words, because of shade ; and without shade the universe would be objectless, and, in fact, invisible. The atheist was dreaming of shadowless light—a contradiction in terms. Mankind may be improved, and the improvement may be infinite, and yet good and evil must exist. So ! with death and life. Life without death is not life, and death without life is equally impossible."—(p. 109.)

The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church. By F. E. WARREN, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. London: Henry Frowde. 1881.

THIS volume contains many choice morsels, and a good deal of general information which, though not new, will fully repay perusal. Its main interest, however, lies in a Mass taken from the "Stowe" Irish Missal.

We have at once to observe that Mr. Warren would have been more of a historian had he been less of a polemic. Throughout his book he seeks an opportunity for stating that the Celtic practices point to an Eastern rather than a Roman origin, and that the Celtic churches were strangers to Papal Supremacy. He maintains that the discipline in these churches was introduced from the East, only indirectly through France. But he ought to have asked himself how it is that the Gallican Church never dreamed of doing, on the alleged difference of discipline, what others do—viz., disputing Roman Supremacy. The river ought not to rise higher than its source. The Celtic Churches have not more solid grounds to go on than the Gallican Church.

Apart from the doctrinal aspect, we hasten to notice some of the historical mistakes in Mr. Warren's volume. 1. It is stated in page 127, that "no passage is discovered referring to the use of incense." Now, we maintain that its use is prescribed in a very old form for consecration of a church. O'Donovan, in his "Irish Grammar," alludes to its archaic turns, and O'Curry states that its Irish is beyond the reach of all printed dictionaries. This tract taken from the Irish Pontifical is found in the "Leabhar Breac." The passage runs thus :—"And the incense is offered in the small vessel in front of the altar while they sing 'Let my prayer be directed as incense,' &c."* I may observe that the form of consecration not alluded to by Mr. Warren is perfect, except one or two chasms which can be filled in from the context. 2. In page 23 it is stated, that "the reception of a nun into a Celtic monastery included, in addition to the ceremony of crowning, the formal presentation of a white dress, which is not in the present Pontifical." We are surprised how it could be said that mention of a crown and dress is not made in the Pontifical in connection with the veiling of a nun, as the rubric and prayer speak of the *corona*, or *torques*, and of the dress which she is to put on after having received it and a veil blessed by the bishop. 3. It is not correct to state in page 146, that "there is no direct evidence of the practice of fasting for communion." In a very old tract in the "Leabhar Breac," fasting is enjoined, *Nullus cantet nisi jejunos*.† Nor was the injunction confined to the celebrant. A writer, who had objected that it was not so at the first institution of the Eucharist, as the apostles partook of it after eating the paschal lamb, goes on to defend and account for the opposite practice in his day.‡ 4. It is stated in pp. 148-9, that "confession of sins was public rather than private, optional rather than compulsory." Now, in an eighth century tract it is stated that "one of the four things not admitted to penance in the Church of Erin is the disclosing the confession."§ It is plain that if the confession were public there would have been no need of enjoining secrecy under such a terrible sanction. It is equally obvious that confession was not optional; for it was laid down that "every one desirous of a cure for

* "Leabhar Breac," p. 277, col. 1.

† *Ibid.* p. 50, col. 2.

‡ *Ibid* R. I. A. copy, p. 248, col. 1.

§ *Ibid.* p. 10, col. 2.

his soul must make a humble and sorrowful confession, and that, as the wounds of the body are shown to a physician, so, too, the sores of the soul must be exposed; and as he who takes poison is saved by vomit, so the soul is healed by confession.* 5. It is stated in page 108, that "there is no instance recorded of the modern practice of praying to departed saints." What becomes of the famous eighth-century litany to the Immaculate Virgin? Why, in the Stowe Missal which was under Mr. Warren's eye when writing, there are prayers to the saints. Their intercession is asked in folio 28*b*: "Omnium quoque sanctorum pro nobis Dominum Deum nostrum exorare dignentur." Again, in folio 39*a*, the prayers of the martyrs are asked for the living and dead: "Orent pro nobis sancti martyres et pro defunctis." 6. In page 6 it is stated, that "customs and ritual peculiar to the ancient Church of the country existed long after the eighth century, namely, the commencement of Lent, on the first Monday of Lent." With all respect, this was not peculiar to any of the Celtic churches. We learn on the authority of Dom. Mabillon that for centuries Lent began on a Monday in the Roman Church.† 7. It is asserted, in page 140, that "there does not appear to have been a daily Eucharist in the Celtic Church, but only on Sundays," &c. Now, the contradictory is established by Celtic documents. Thus, in the "Leabhar Breac" we read, "As it was profitable formerly to believe in the Divinity under the lowly form of humanity, so is it now to believe in it under the appearance of bread. Jesus Christ blesses and sanctifies the poor elements every day."‡ So again, an Irish writer, commenting on the Lord's Prayer, after giving several explanations of the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread," says that "it could signify the body and blood of Christ, which the faithful receive in the Sacrament *every day* from the dish of the Lord—that is, from the holy altar."§

Facts relied on by Mr. Warren for opposition to Rome, when properly understood, lead up to connection with it, and dependence on it. In good truth a volume might be filled with evidence in favour of a direct connection between Roman and Celtic practices. At the same time, it may be admitted that many practices in the Latin Church had an Eastern origin. Even traces of an Eastern origin may be seen in parts of the Mass; and there was a time when, previous to the Eastern schism, as a mark of union and affection, the lessons and canticles were from time to time read in Greek in the Western Church. But though every bit of discipline in the Western Church were to have come from the East to us, as did come Christianity and the first Roman pope, still it would not affect in the least the belief of catholics in the Papal Supremacy.

S. M.

* "Leabhar Breac," p. 257, col. 2.

† "Mus. Ital." vol. ii. p. 127.

‡ "Leabhar Breac," p. 257, col. 1.

§ *Ibid.* p. 249, col. 1.

Sancti Bonaventuræ Ord. Minor. Episc. Card. et Eccl. Doct. Seraph. Breviloquium, adjectis illustrationibus ex aliis operibus ejusd. doct. depromptis, &c. Opera et studio P. ANTONII MARIAE A VICETIA, Refor. Prov. Venetæ Lector. Theol. et Ministri Provincialis. Editio altera ab auctore recognita. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder. 1881.

Lexicon Bonaventurianum Philosophico-Theologicum, in quo termini theologici, distinctiones et effata præcipua Scholasticorum a Seraphico Doctore declarantur. Opera et studio P.P. ANTONII MARIAE A VICETIA et JOANNIS A RUBINO. Venetiis: Typographia Æmiliana. 1880.

ALTHOUGH the Franciscan Fathers of the Convent of Onarachi, near Florence, are busily occupied in the preparation of a new and critical edition of Saint Bonaventure's Works, we are, nevertheless, deeply indebted to Father Antonio of Vicenza for his new edition of the immortal "Breviloquium." Catholics, and I may add, Protestants of the old orthodox party, are unanimous in praise of this theological compend.

The judgment passed on it by Professor Baumgarten-Crusius is well known in Germany. The "Breviloquium," he said, is the "all but best theology of the middle ages." Indeed, it seems as if the Seraphic doctor had concentrated into this small volume the most sublime theology of all his other works. Hence his style is sometimes not without difficulty for the student, whilst every page contains a world of the deepest ideas, which he, in a masterly manner, deduces from first principles of philosophy and theology. The treasures of the "Breviloquium" require, therefore, a solid commentary and elucidatory notes. Commentaries drawn from other works of the saint will, beyond any doubt, be all the more acceptable, as they show his theological system and terminology, and make the author supply his own key to the difficulties of the "Breviloquium." Father Maria Antonio has done his work in a manner that will commend itself to all Catholic divines. In the first place, the accuracy of the text deserves a special mention. It was not printed until the best editions of the European libraries had been consulted. Every page of this edition testifies to the learned Father's ability and diligence. Secondly, the editor has accompanied the text by foot notes gathered from the Councils of Trent and the Vatican, from decrees of Popes, and decisions of Roman congregations. The important letters of Leo XIII., commenting on the sacrament of matrimony, the disastrous theories of socialism, and the value of the study of philosophy are largely quoted. In explaining St. Bonaventure's treatise on the creation of the world, our editor very appropriately shows the impossibility of reconciling the Seraphic doctor's opinion with Mr. Darwin's system.

The reader will be aware of the fact that, during the contests of some Catholic scholars in our century, St. Bonaventure has been brought forward as a champion of Ontologism; but very wrongly, as everybody may learn from the comments, pp. 126-128, taken from

2 dist. 3, p. 2, a. 2, q. 2, where our saint formally lays down the principle that our natural cognition of God starts from the contemplation of the world surrounding us: "Deus cognoscitur per creaturas tantum a viatoribus." Each chapter of this edition is followed by copious quotations from other works of the saint; and each of the seven parts of the "Breviloquium" is enriched with special "tables," giving at a glance the whole of the subjects treated. Elaborate indices are also added, and much facilitate the use of the volume.

The same editor, in conjunction with Father Rubino, gives us the "Lexicon Bonaventurianum," the value of which will be fully appreciated after the publication of the new edition of the saint's works. It is composed of three parts: the first explains philosophical terms; the second, "distinctions;" the third, "effata," or "theoremata." Any one wishing to study St. Bonaventure successfully, could scarcely find more trustworthy guides than these two volumes.

BELLESHEIM.

Die geheimen Gesellschaften in Spanien und ihre Stellung zur Kirche und Staat; von ihrem Eindringen in das Königreich bis zum Tode Ferdinand's VII. Von Dr. HEINRICH BRÜCK, Professor der Theologie am bischöflichen Seminar zu Mainz. Mainz: Kirchheim. 1881. (History of the Secret Societies in Spain, and their position towards Church and State.)

CATHOLICS, not only in Germany, but all over the world, will read this book with great interest. It affords plenty of information about the destructive agency of secret societies, and clearly shows what sort of fate is reserved for Governments that despise the teachings of the Catholic Church, and trust to the counsels and guidance of her most bitter enemies. In the introduction our author gives most accurate details about the first arrival and propagation of the secret societies in Spain; afterwards he treats, in four chapters: (1), the struggles of those societies to obtain influence (pp. 14-74); (2), the dominion of the secret societies (pp. 74-124); (3), persecution and suppression of the Church by means of the secret societies (pp. 125-261); (4), the secret societies after the re-establishment of the Government, to the death of Ferdinand VII. Professor Brück, as a true historian, never brings forward his own opinion, but he makes the leading Spanish statesmen and the freemasons themselves the *dramatis personæ* of his work. That work is the more valuable because of a most rare collection of Spanish books referring to the period, which he has had the good fortune to employ in its composition. I may mention the "Biblioteca de Religion ó sea Coleccion de obras contra la incredulidad y errores de estos ultimos tiempos," which comprises not less than twenty-five volumes. Also, the "Historias de las Sociedades Secretas, antiguas y modernas en España y especialmente de la Franc Masoneria, por Vincente de la Fuente;" and the "Coleccion eclesiastica Española comprensiva de los Breves de N. S., notas del Nuncio, representaciones de los Obispos." The results of the author's able

quiry are : (1), that the Spanish revolutions under Ferdinand VII. were the work of the secret societies, who employed for their anti-religious purposes high officers of the army ; and that the bulk of the Catholic people did not consent in the least ; (2), that what the societies aimed at was the oppression of the Catholic Church ; (3), inquiring into the causes which most helped the revolutionary agency of the secret societies, we find that, besides the great irregularities in the public administration, it was the *English Government* which unremittingly protected the revolution in Spain. But the more cruel the hardships which the Church and priests had to undergo, the more do the zeal, doctrine, and apostolic patience of the defenders whom God raised up to her claim our admiration. The bishops were ably supported by the Nuncio Giustiniani, who, as a clever canonist, unveiled the sophisms resorted to by the Government in their decrees against the liberties of the Church. It is curious that in the Church politics of Spain, as originated by Gallicanism, Jansenism, and Napoleonism, no attempt was made to introduce civil marriage ; this gloomy institution, however, is to be obtruded on the Spanish Church of our own day. We cannot but earnestly recommend this excellent historical work.

BELLESHEIM.

Lex Salica : The Ten Texts with The Glosses, and The Lex Emendata. Synoptically Edited by J. H. HESSELS. With Notes on the Frankish words in the "Lex Salica," by H. KERN, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Leiden. London : John Murray. 1880.

FEW historical materials have remained in a more unsatisfactory condition than the laws of the barbarian nations which occupied the various members of the ruined Western Empire. There has been no lack of editions, and there is generally no lack of manuscripts ; but the very multitude and dispersion of these latter have made it, until quite recent times, a difficult, if not impossible task for an editor not merely to master, but even to ascertain, the extant material. Though numerous and ancient, the manuscripts not infrequently come from the hands of scribes who did not understand what they were copying, whilst the legal texts themselves varied in the course of time to meet changed conditions.

The "Lex Salica," to facilitate the study of which the volume under notice has been issued, is amongst the most important of these popular laws. An eminent jurist has not hesitated, indeed, to assert that its principles pervaded all the legal systems of Western Europe in the Middle Ages, found their way with the Normans into England, and hereby, in the length of centuries have penetrated, through the colonial empire of Britain, into every part of the world. There may be sceptics who will not credit the seer in so far reaching a vision. But the importance of the document is incontestable as presenting the liveliest picture of the social and political state of those Franks

designated Salian, in contradistinction to their riverain brethren, who conquered, made themselves a home in, and gave their name to, ancient Gaul.

When it is said that (setting aside Hubé's print of a single MS. of no very special value, and one or two reprints of less account) within the last forty years four editions of the "*Lex Salica*" have appeared (those of Pardessus, Waitz, Merkel and Behrend); that a fifth by Dr. Alfred Holder, of Carlsruhe, is in course of publication; and that a sixth has been for some time in preparation for the "*Monumenta Germaniæ*," the appearance of Mr. Hessels' volume may seem to require a justification, which is to be sought,—and, we venture to think, will be amply found—in a review of the aims of the various editors, and the different means adopted to meet the difficulties which an editor of the "*Lex*" has to contend with. These difficulties are twofold: First, the varying divisions of the subject matter in the various "*families*" of manuscripts, and in the different manuscripts of the same family; secondly—and this is much more serious—the great and continual discrepancy between the several texts of the same passage, complicated again by almost incredible blunders of the scribes to an extent which, at times, necessitates a patient comparison one with another of half-a-dozen corrupt texts before a tolerable, not to say probable, meaning can be extracted from them.

The adoption of ordinary editorial methods in a case like this must result in the constitution of a text more or less arbitrary, supported by an array of various readings so intricate as to be unintelligible. This very practical consideration induced Pardessus, who was the first to undertake, or rather publish the results of, an examination of the manuscripts themselves on an extensive scale, to select eight texts which he printed in full, one after another, in a quarto volume in 1843. Waitz had regard in his edition to the four manuscripts only which are agreed to represent the earliest extant redaction, and attempted to construct therefrom a text which should come, as near as possible, to the lost original. Merkel's and Behrend's editions, though hardly exceeding the size of a pamphlet, are not restricted like that of Waitz to a single class of manuscripts, but are intended in the smallest possible space to take account of the various families, and include as appendices later edicts and capitulars and other relative documents. Both are meant primarily for the use of the professor and his pupils in the schools. Merkel adopted in general Pardessus's first text for his print of the "*Lex*" as a whole. This was followed by the additions and most important variants of the other texts, each text being taken separately by itself. Behrend's edition avoided the defects of this faulty and very inconvenient arrangement by bringing together the additions and a selection of various readings in their proper place under each *titulus* and section to which they belong. Holder, whose work is not completed, has reverted to the method of Pardessus, inasmuch as he prints the text of each important manuscript in full; but instead of binding up all in a single volume, he devotes a separate fasciculus to every one (sometimes to two), and his exactitude in detail goes to

the point of giving what is equivalent to a facsimile reproduction of the MSS.

The drawbacks of each of these plans for minute and independent examination and study are evident. Pardessus and Holder do, indeed, contemplate affording the material itself sufficiently full and complete; but in neither case is the essential condition fulfilled of presenting in one view all the various forms in which each passage of the "Lex" has come down to us. Mr. Hessels has carried out what others have desired to do, but despaired of doing, on account of typographical (among other) difficulties. His quarto gives (every two pages being divided into nine columns) in one view the eight texts in full of Pardessus, on a recollection of the manuscripts, with the necessary various readings,—the whole reduced to the order of the texts of the oldest redaction. The ninth column is devoted to "observations,"—in the main, a series of useful references to parallel passages of other of the popular laws. To state so much gives an altogether inadequate idea of the pains taken by the editor to bring something of clearness into an intricate document, which cannot but be troublesome to deal with. The general disposition, and the particular arrangements of the volume, betoken a nice consideration of the best means of easing the labours of the scholar who would undertake a study of the "Lex Salica." The type is small, but admirably clear; the various readings are conveniently distributed. The general introduction, and the preliminary observations to the prologues and various appendices, whilst studiously concise and business like, say all that is necessary for the immediate purpose. The reproduction of the MSS. is not so minute as that of Dr. Holder; that it is reasonably sufficient for all possible purposes may appear from the fact that the letters represented in the manuscripts by contractions are given in the print in italics; whilst the texts issued contemporaneously by Holder afford a proof, which cannot but be gratifying to Hessels, of his own general exactitude. Reference is facilitated by the numbering of each *column* of text; the index is remarkably full (125 small print quarto columns, as compared with 27 octavo pages in Behrend's edition) and is not the least useful part of the volume; though called glossarial, it is not an index of meanings, but rather a index of reference to the passages in the "Lex" where each word is to be found, in fact a verbal concordance. Lastly, the notes of Professor Kern on the so-called "Malberg Glosses," occupying about a third part of the book, form a sort of perpetual commentary on these, almost the only extant, remains of ancient dialect of the Salian Franks, and carry forward the investigations of which the first fruits were recorded in his work on the subject published in 1869.

Mr. Hessels professedly limits himself to the task of supplying materials and facilities for a thorough study of the "Lex Salica," and disclaims all intention of giving "what is usually called a 'critical' edition." This latter, in fact, he does not give. For such an edition we must doubtless look to that which is now preparing for the "Monumenta." Without presuming to detract beforehand from the value of

this future edition, we yet cannot but express a conviction that the utility of Mr. Hessels' volume to those who have occasion to occupy themselves seriously with this most important of the barbarian laws, will outlast the appearance of any edition, however critical and however extensive the apparatus on which it may be based.

Poems: Patriotic, Religious, Miscellaneous. By ABRAM J. RYAN ("Father Ryan"). Baltimore: John B. Piet. 1880.

THIS handsome volume of "Poems" is introduced to us by two "Prefaces"—one by the author, the other by the publisher. The publisher may not, possibly, be a critic; one would hardly think he is. His preface is extremely laudatory, and would lead us to think that Father Ryan has already taken a high place among the Immortals. The writer says that "for years the name of Father Ryan has been a household word; it is known wherever the English language is spoken, and everywhere it is revered as the appellation of a true child of song." "These Poems," he says, "have moved multitudes; they have thrilled the soldier on the eve of battle, and quickened the matril impulses of a chivalric race; they have soothed the soul-wounds of the suffering; and they have raised the hearts of men in adoration and benediction to the great Father of all." This is enthusiastic language, and it makes one feel that, if it is all true, one is not quite *au niveau* with the poetical literature of the day. But when we turn to Father Ryan's "Preface," the honest, outspoken estimate he makes of himself rather re-assures us. "These Verses," he says ("which some friends call by the higher title of Poems—to which appellation the author objects), were written at random—off and on, here, there, anywhere—just when the mood came, with little study, and less of art, and always in a hurry." These words give us a true insight into these Poems. They are the thoughts of a poetical nature thrown off at random, and without much labour. But perhaps it is for this reason that there is more soul and fire in many of them, and that they drop sparks that kindle and glow into the hearts of those who read. We may say, without fear of exaggeration, of Father Ryan, what a brilliant poet of our day says of Collins, that he has in him "a pulse of inborn music, irresistible and indubitable;" and we can understand why, in a time of excitement and under the thrill of the trumpet-blast of war, the people of South America should feel that Father Ryan's verses gave expression to their heart-throbs.

We give a specimen of his patriotic verses, entitled

"THE SWORD OF ROBERT LEE."

Forth from its scabbard, pure and bright,
 Flashed the sword of Lee!
 Far in the front of the deadly fight,
 High o'er the brave in the cause of Right,
 Its stainless sheen, like a beacon light,
 Led us to victory.

Out of its scabbard, where, full long,
It slumbered peacefully,
Roused from its rest by the battle's song,
Shielding the feeble, smiting the strong,
Guarding the right, avenging the wrong,
Gleamed the sword of Lee.

Forth from its scabbard, high in air
Beneath Virginia's sky—
And they who saw it gleaming there,
And knew who bore it, knelt to swear
That where that sword led, they would dare
To follow—and to die.

Out of its scabbard! Never hand
Waved sword from stain as free,
Nor purer sword led braver band,
Nor heroes bled for a brighter land,
Nor brighter land had a cause so grand,
Nor cause a chief like Lee!

Forth from its scabbard! How we prayed
That sword might victor be;
And when our triumph was delayed,
And many a heart grew sore afraid,
We still hoped on while gleamed the blade
Of noble Robert Lee.

Forth from its scabbard all in vain
Bright flashed the sword of Lee;
'Tis shrouded now in its sheath again.
It sleeps the sleep of our noble slain,
Defeated, yet without a stain,
Proudly and peacefully.

Some of the "religious" verses have a vividness, and a warmth of devotion, and a beauty about them that have come straight out of the heart of the *priest*. We may venture to say, without fear of error, that these "Poems" of the Priest-Poet of America will be very acceptable to many readers on both sides of the Atlantic.

Catholic Controversy: a Reply to Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons."

By H. I. D. RYDER, of the Oratory. London: Burns & Oates.
1881.

"IT is much more easy," as Fr. Ryder justly remarks, "to catch popular approval by the brilliancy of an assault, than to command it by the steady virtues of a defence." The work which he had before him was one of extreme difficulty, and we must frankly confess that we thought it well-nigh impossible for anyone to execute it in a satisfactory way. Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons" is a repertory of almost every charge that can be made against the Catholic Church. The charges are made with a coarseness and exaggeration which often overshoots its mark; and, as Fr. Ryder shows, Dr. Littledale displays a reckless disregard for accuracy. Still, it needed no small skill to say so much ill of the Church in so small a compass. Dr. Littledale's style,

if coarse, is not without incisiveness and nervous force; there is an affectation of learning and a tone of confidence in his book which cannot have failed to influence many of his readers. He wished to leave on the minds of the general Protestant public an impression very damaging to the Catholic Church, and in this no doubt he has succeeded. *Ἀπέχει τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.* He has his reward out.

We repeat, it seemed an impossible thing to write an effective answer. It is a wearisome affair to expose a long series of exaggerations, suppressions of the truth, historical blunders, and the like. The accusation is usually short and stinging, the answer is apt to be long and dull. However, Fr. Ryder has succeeded in a task which might well have been judged desperate, and no competent person will doubt that he deserves the warmest thanks of educated Catholics. He has done an enduring service to the Church in England, and a translation of his little book would prove of signal utility in Germany, and perhaps in France.

To begin with, he has entirely demolished Dr. Littledale's credit. This, in our opinion, is the least important of the services he has rendered. Still, it was well worth doing, for the "Plain Reasons" have been issued in a stereotyped edition by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; they have been used against us freely enough already, and promised to become the favourite manual of Protestant controversy. The demolition is as thorough as any demolition can be. Fr. Ryder has tracked his adversary through garbled quotations, exposed his ignorance on points of Catholic theology which he presumes to discuss, and his recklessness in inventing and repeating baseless calumnies. We need not say how much labour it must have cost to do this; and while thanking Fr. Ryder for the laborious learning which he has brought to bear on his opponent, we cannot help congratulating the former on the good fortune which has attended him. It was not possible for Dr. Littledale to produce sound arguments against joining the Church; still, he might of course have succeeded in raking up cases of real scandal, and so contrived to help Protestant prejudice, without sinning against historical truth. As it is, a strange fatality appears to have attended Dr. Littledale. He collects his materials from Fathers, mediæval writers, modern newspapers; but from whatever source his statements profess to come, he seldom fails to blunder ludicrously.

Besides this, "Catholic Controversy" is one of the most interesting books we ever opened. It cannot fail to absorb the attention of the reader, and no intelligent person with a slight interest in such matters will be able to lay it down till he has perused it from end to end. This extraordinary fascination—for we can call it nothing else—is due partly to the charm of style, which is at least as trenchant as Dr. Littledale's; while it has a grace, a fertility of happy illustration, and an unfailing urbanity of tone, to none of which qualities Dr. Littledale can make any claim. It must also be attributed to the fact that, whereas the "Plain Reasons" is a mere heap of accusations thrown together without system or order, Fr. Ryder begins with a luminous treatise on the Papal prerogative as exhibited in Scripture and tradition; and even when he is obliged to answer a great number of